LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Chap. BX8995 Copyright No.

Shelf .E7

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

THE

WITNESSING CHURCH

IN ITS RELATION TO

CHURCH UNION, CIVIL GOVERNMENT, AND TEMPERANCE REFORM IN ITS POLITICAL ASPECTS,

BY

Rev. F. M. FOSTER,

PASTOR OF THE THIRD REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,

23D STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
COPYRIGHT
MAR 31 1890
5937
WASHINGTON.

BX8995
.F7

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1890,
By F. M. Foster,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

Press of J. W. Pratt & Son, 73-79 Fulton Street, New York.

To My

SESSION AND CONGREGATION,

Beloved in the Lord,

SO PATIENT WITH MY IMPERFECTIONS, SO WILLING
TO ENTER ON EVERY GOOD WORK,

THIS VOLUME

IS

KINDLY INSCRIBED.

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

I. Church Drift..... 7
II. The Witnessing Church..... 23
III. Church Union—The State of the Question, 29
IV. Church Union—Theories Proposed..... 37
V. Church Union—The True Basis..... 56
VI. The Witnessing Church and Open Pulpits, 63
VII. Is the Reformed Presbyterian Church an Evangelistic Church?..... 74
VIII. Growth of the Denomination—Hindrances, 88
IX. The Witnessing Church and Civil Government—General Principles..... 100
X. Application of Principles to Constitution, 113
XI. Dissent..... 125
XII. Objections to Dissent..... 137
XIII. Should the Witnessing Church Give Up Dissent?..... 142
XIV. Oath of Allegiance and Civil Office..... 162
XV. The Witnessing Church and Temperance—General Principles..... 172
XVI. Constitutional Prohibition and a Godless Government..... 189
XVII. Covenanters and Voting for Amendments, 207
XVIII. Voting and Orthodoxy..... 219
XIX. The Outlook..... 225

PREFACE.

THIS book is practically a series of sermons delivered in the pulpit of the Third Church by the author. The subjects are deeply interesting, as they are of great importance just now. The question of church union is attracting wide attention and promises to be of special public interest for years to come. The question of "dissent and protest" demands just now special attention within the denomination. The undermining forces are active and persistent. They wish to surrender up the denomination. The question of "voting for amendments" has, it is true, been determined by Synod in the affirmative. But to "vote" is believed by many in the denomination to be a giving up of dissent and protest. It appears that some voted for such decision in the interests of liberalism, and now demand that the church take a further step. Moreover, the decision puts the denomination in a position so metaphysical that devout Christians in sister churches, who are able to see a point if there is any, declare their inability to understand the hair-splitting distinctions upon which the denomination founds its right to separate denominational existence. This differs widely from the former position occupied by the church; it was clearly seen, but not believed. The resolution passed by Synod is believed

to put the church in a wrong light before the world; subjects it to some ridicule; is made the stepping-stone to greater wrongs; and should be recalled. To say to candidate for membership that there are some votes you can cast and other votes you cannot cast; that the one is a recognition of the government while the other is not; that he should go and cast the one and hold up his hands and swear before God that he who casts the other is sinning against heaven and against the light, would appear to be an invitation to sensible candidates to escape away from such Court of God's House as soon as possible.

Furthermore, liberalism seems to be "in the air." Old landmarks are being forsaken. Old doctrines are being repudiated. "What will please the world?" seems to be asked everywhere. The trend of the Christian Church is not out into the light. The tendency is back toward Rome. These influences are insidious and treacherous. In the midst of all these evils, this breaking up, this breaking away, the voice of our beloved Lord should be the more earnestly heeded: "Stand in the way, and see, and ask for the old paths, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls."

If the following pages shall be of comfort and assistance to one humble servant of God, they shall not have been sent in vain. And all the glory be to the all-wise God, our Saviour.

THE AUTHOR.

CHAPTER I.

THE ATTAINMENTS OF THE REFORMATION ARE IN DANGER.

SHALL THEY BE GIVEN UP?

In no age and in no nation has the church had such advantages as in this age and in this land. Her privileges and opportunities are marvelous. The wealth, in learning and experience, reaching back through six thousand years, is laid at her feet. Nearly every foot of Bible lands has been overturned, and the hidden treasures revealed. The most exhaustive research, the keenest investigation, have greatly multiplied the church's resources. It would be expected that the church would rise to clearer statement of doctrine and duty than ever before; that she would hold the "truth as it is in Jesus" with more invincible determination, and with less "doubtful disputation" than in any period of the past. Such being expected, the tendencies to greater liberality and latitudinarian views; the willingness to surrender the "blood-bought" truths, and give up positions

formerly held; the jeopardy in which the attainments of the Reformation are now put, should produce more serious consideration and alarm. It is plain, even to the superficial observer, that there is "drift" in all the churches. Some move more rapidly, and plunge from heights to others beneath as they sweep down with the current. Others, more conservative, move more cautiously and plant themselves on the lower position, as they begin again to survey the one just beneath. Perhaps the Presbyterian family of churches is most marked, just now, in the liberality with which they construe doctrine, and in undisguised effort to be rid of honorable and venerable standards. It is in place here to speak of the common possessions, the Confession of Faith, the Catechisms, Larger and Shorter, before there be particular reference to new tendencies in our own beloved Zion.

EFFORTS AT REVISION.

The reader is well aware of the movement, popularly known as "Revision." This was authoritatively set forth by the GENERAL ASSEMBLY of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, at the meeting in May, 1889. This Assembly represents a body of Christians seven hundred thousand strong. The questions which the Assembly submitted to their two hundred Presbyteries are these two: 1st. "Do you desire a revision of the Confession

of Faith?" 2d. "If so, in what respects and to what extent?"

This transferred the battle-ground to the floor of Presbyteries. The second question puts the whole of the Confession into the crucible. The debates in the various Presbyteries are as sad as they are interesting. Some wish the Confession to be retired; that it be venerated as a relic of the past, but no longer of binding obligation. These would supply its place by a shorter Statement as a "working creed." Some of the most influential men, such as Drs. Hastings and Schaff, of Union Seminary, and others equally celebrated, wish the Confession to be left as it is, and an abbreviated Confession, up with the times, put in its room. The old Confession is, by many, denounced in severe terms. We stand amazed at the language used. You would suppose that the Westminster Assembly, in setting forth certain Chapters, were the foes alike of God and man, utterly ignorant of Scripture and the laws of Interpretation. That the Presbytery of New York voted for revising the Confession by a majority of 67 to 15 is significant. It shows the force of opposition to the Standards. A high authority in the Presbyterian Church says of Revision:

"Whether it carry at the next Assembly or not, the end is inevitable. Of this I myself have no

doubt. If it carry now, we shall have a conservative revision. If not, we shall have later on a radical one."

The Presbyterian Church of England has preceded its American sister in the matter of Revision. They have been working at it for six years. Final action has not yet been taken, but will probably be taken at their next Assembly. The matter stands thus: "The Committee, as the result of their labors, have submitted to the church: First, Modified formulas of adhesion to Confession: Next, a Declaratory Statement in explanation of it; and lastly, a compendium of doctrine, entitled, 'The Articles of the Faith.' These 'Articles of the Faith' are twenty-four in number." A critical examination of these Articles shows that they are seriously defective; that they cast doubts on Inspiration, and compromise many truths of the Word of God.

The FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND is also keeping abreast with the latitudinarian views and tendencies of the times. Its first marked step was the election of Dr. Marcus Dods to the Chair of New Testament Exegesis in the New College, Edinburgh. He is a man of notoriously unsound views on inspiration. At the last General Presbyterian Council, London, 1888, his paper was understood to deny the infallibility of the Bible, and was severely criticised by the sound men in

the Council who had opportunity to speak. Dr. Dods has repeatedly proclaimed his belief that the Bible is not an infallible book; that there are "mistakes and immoralities" in the Old Testament; that "there are inaccuracies in the Gospels and elsewhere—inaccuracies such as occur in ordinary writings through imperfect information or lapse of memory," and that "these are . . . . sufficient entirely to explode the averment of literal infallibility." Notwithstanding these views, Dr. Dods was elected to the Chair of New Testament Exegesis, the last place where such unsound views should be found.

But the Free Church took another step. No fewer than thirty overtures were sent up to their Assembly, looking to changes in the Confession of Faith, or the adoption of "a new working Confession, a shorter Confession which would adequately meet the needs of the church." Those on the ground, therefore in position to know, state without hesitation, that "the real thing that lies at the root of the agitation is *hostility to the Calvinism of the Confession.*" It is not difficult to conjecture results in the Free Church of Scotland.

The United Presbyterian Church of Scotland has solved the problem of Revision, by "adopting a Declaratory Act, defining the sense in which the Standards are to be subscribed." Dr.

William Taylor, in his Yale Lectures, says, "This is the earliest attempt on the part of any Presbyterian Church to define the sense in which the Westminster Standards are understood to be subscribed by its office bearers." The Declaratory Act contains seven specifications, more or less sweeping in their character, and commands that this formula be put to the office bearer: ". . . . this acknowledgment (of the Confession) being made in view of the explanations contained in the Declaratory Act of the Synod thereanent."

The efforts at Revision in the various branches of the Presbyterian family show that the venerable Standards are being dethroned. Just where will be the final resting place is not clear. Dr. John Hall uses these forceful words: "I have never known more decided and pronounced gypsies, in an ecclesiastical sense, than those have proved themselves to be who turned their backs on the Standards of our Presbyterian Church." (*Reception to General Assembly, New York, 1889.*)

The UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH of United States has seriously corrupted its doctrine and worship by the introduction of instrumental music. This is especially remarkable because of the high position this denomination formerly held. This denomination of one hundred and ten thousand has thrown all its weight, and the far-

reaching effect of its teaching and example, against God's voice in this matter, and against its own past glorious history. They have practically revised the faith with which former United Presbyterians found no fault, and in which they denied that there is error, whenever the allegation was made by the enemies of the faith. The present position of that church is an impeachment of their intelligence and doctrinal soundness. But the character of the impeached, their holy life and saintly walk, their commanding intellect, their understanding of the Scriptures, lose nothing by comparison with those who have pronounced the condemnation. But their testimony has been set aside, and the United Presbyterian Church becomes a witness before the world against its former self, against the churches which are yet pure in worship, and has openly avowed a most dangerous principle which is making the worship of God in fashionable churches a mockery, viz.: GOD MAY BE WORSHIPED IN OTHER WAYS NOT COMMANDED IN HIS WORD. This action on the part of the United Presbyterian denomination introduces another element of disharmony. That open communion is getting a strong hold, cannot be successfully contradicted. And fears are entertained, by those in position to know, that hymn singing is looked upon with comparative indifference. Thus the tide

rolls on, and gives unquestionable evidence of "drift."

LINES OF ASSAULT.

The field in which Progressive Theology is now distinguishing itself, and where it is fortifying to the best of its ability, and against the attainments of the Reformation, is, 1st: Its assaults on "verbal inspiration." It insists that "the holy men of God, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," used such words as they pleased, without direction of the Spirit.

2d. It claims to have destroyed the authority of the old textus receptus of the New, and to have undermined the Masoretic text of the Old, Testaments. These are the texts in Greek and Hebrew, whence come our present version of the Bible.

3d. It disputes the authorship of certain books of the Bible, as Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, part of the Psalms, parts of Isaiah, Matthew, Luke, John, Hebrews, etc. It takes stronger grounds on some of these than others. But after Progressive Theology has done what it could to destroy faith in the authorship, saying Moses did not write the first five books—the Pentateuch, it appropriates the doubt by questioning the inspiration of those books; and suggests that parts of these have been compiled by ordinary men, guided by nothing but their ordinary intelligence.

4th. Progressive Theology dethrones miracles as one of the infallible evidences. It says: "To many minds it would be easier to believe in the inspiration of the Scriptures and the divinity of Christ if there were no such things as miracles and predictions in the sacred Scriptures." "It has been easier to prove the divinity of Christ without miracles."

5th. It exalts contemporary history of the Bible as a fixed standard by which the records of the Bible are to be examined and tried, and to which it must in many respects yield.

These liberal tendencies are led by men of advanced views on inspiration; men accepting the teachings and investigations of higher criticism; men who are tainted with the theories of second probation; men befogged in their study of the attributes of God, and confuse justice and love. The high-water-mark of these advanced theories, and to which is the trend of the great Presbyterian Church, is set by Dr. Briggs, Professor in the Presbyterian Union Theological Seminary, New York, in his last work, entitled, "WHITHER." The reader will realize the startling character and the far-reaching possibilities of the theories advanced. That they should be held, allowed, and taught in the Presbyterian Seminary is one of the significant signs of the times.

"The study of the future state in recent times," says Dr. Briggs, "has exposed the faults of the older dogmaticians. It has shown that the doctrine of a private judgment at death has no support in the Scriptures or the creeds, and that it obstructed and obscured the doctrines of the *dies irae*, the ultimate judgment of the world.

"It has shown that the current theology confuses and confounds the hell and heaven of the middle state, and the hell and heaven of the ultimate state after the day of judgment, and it has accordingly made the middle state more of a reality to many minds.

"It has held up the light of Christian ethics, and shown that the doctrine of immediate sanctification at death is contrary to the Scripture and the creeds, and has filled the middle state with ethical contents, as a place for Christian sanctification.

"It has called attention to the fact that Jesus Christ knows of but one unpardonable sin, the sin against the Holy Spirit; and asks what is its significance in view of the middle state?

"It has revived the doctrine of the Apostles' Creed, of the descent of Jesus into hades, His preaching to the imprisoned spirits and His redemption of souls from the ancient abode of the dead.

"It has called attention to the inconsistency

into which the church has drifted in the new doctrine of the universal salvation of infants, and has demanded that this doctrine shall be considered in some way, so as to correspond with the Protestant doctrine of the order of salvation.

"It has so pressed the awfulness of the doctrine of the eternal damnation of the heathen world, exceeding the Christian world by hundreds of millions, that the older doctrine of the damnation of all the heathen has been abandoned, and efforts have been made to find some mode of relief by which some or many of the heathen may be saved by the grace of God."

Rev. Phillip Schaff, D. D., Professor in Union Seminary, says:

"The Westminster Confession of Faith . . . . contains certain supralapsarian or hyper-Calvinistic features. . . . These are the connected doctrines of reprobation, preterition, limited atonement, and the damnation of the whole non-Christian world. . . . Foreordination of some men to everlasting life, and of others to everlasting death, and preterition of all the non-elect (INCLUDING THE WHOLE HEATHEN WORLD) are equally inconsistent with a proper conception of Divine justice, pervert it into an arbitrary partiality for a small circle of the elect, and an arbitrary neglect of the great mass of men." (*Paper before Presbytery of New York, Nov., 1889.*)

These are startling theories to receive shelter in the formerly orthodox Presbyterian Church. They suggest a deeply-seated malady, which will yield to nothing but heroic treatment. It is claimed that the demand for revision is because some few doctrines are stated too strongly, as election and predestination; while other doctrines are not sufficiently emphasized, as the love of God. But this is a superficial explanation, and overlooks the strong under-current setting in, in favor of the most advanced and heterodox theories. Revision is but the breaking out of a sore, indicating decline in spiritual health. These new theories are: (a) Always in the interests of liberal thinking; (b) They never encroach on loose morals; (c) They trench on the jurisdiction of God. The Higher or Literary Criticism of the Scriptures; the questioning of the testimony of miracles; the rejection of verbal inspiration, etc., have introduced new elements of doubt, which have weakened the faith of many.

CHURCH WORLDLINESS.

A further evidence of decline in spirituality is set forth by the authority above quoted. "The people object," says Dr. Briggs, "to doctrinal preaching, and even expositions of the Scriptures. The teacher retires into the background, and the preacher who exhorts and applies the Word is in demand and is popular. Rhetorical

qualifications are required, and the question is not asked whether the minister has the Scriptural qualification, 'apt to teach,' but whether he will be popular. As a result, there is a surprising ignorance among intelligent Christians as to the history and doctrines of the church, the theories of government and worship, and even the Scriptures themselves. They know about literature and science, but THEY KNOW NOT THE BIBLE AND CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE."

The Rev. Dr. J. M. Buckley, one of the noted Methodist ministers of New York, in an address before the American Evangelical Alliance, Boston, Dec. 5th, '89, said: "Get rid of extravagance and ostentation in church and private expenditure, WHICH OFTEN MAKES A MINISTER THE MASTER OF CEREMONIES IN AN EXCLUSIVE CLUB. The next need is improvement in our methods of attracting the young. THEY ARE LARGELY SOCIAL, TO A LESS DEGREE INTELLECTUAL, AND VERY LITTLE OF THE SPIRITUAL."

Furthermore, the church as the body of Christ organized for work, is well-nigh buried beneath the multiplicity of societies. These societies do good. But they are not an unmixed good. The church, officered and equipped in the name and by the authority of Christ, is all but hidden away, and lost sight of, by these societies. Being independent of the church, they often run to ex-

tremes, force the members into positions inconsistent with their profession, make them join hands with that against which they testify, and, therefore, along with the good accomplished, they teach error, and are spiritually demoralizing. In all the popular societies, such as the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor in their General Meetings, Young Men's Christian Associations, etc., a corrupt worship is used. But there is still a greater harm: The church, as Christ's organized society, has virtually surrendered the field, in reforms, and in departments of Christian work, to these irresponsible agencies, going so far at times as to raise means through Christ's organized channels, and then turning over the moneys to irresponsible organizations. The bad effects are seen nowhere so much as in the church. The world loses sight of the ORGANIZED CHURCH AS A WORKING FORCE. We conceive that this is: (a) A great dishonor to the church's Head, the Lord Christ; (b) Instills error into the minds of the young; (c) Defeats the purposes for which denominations have solemnly separated from their brethren; (d) measurably nullifies their testimony; (e) And produces a spirit of independence of the authority which Christ lodged in the church. This is the era of societies. It is also the era of the decline of doctrine

and conscientious regard for God's law. It is the era of Sabbath breaking, and Sabbath papers *in the church.* There is a surrender to this part of the devil's infernal artillery. One of the most noted ministers in New York, a pastor of one of the largest churches in one of the orthodox denominations, preached to his people on Sabbath, Nov. 3d, '89, these words: "If you must have a Sabbath paper, do get one that an intelligent Christian man need not be ashamed to have left at his door." Thus the tide rolls on. It is not believed that hope lies in societies. They compromise God's truth in the hope of greater advantage resulting from co-operation, and thus become the incipient stage of error. But hope does lie in BRINGING THE CHURCH OF GOD ONCE MORE TO THE FRONT AS AN ORGANIZED WORKING FORCE. This will honor the church's Head; will exalt His truth and doctrine to their proper place; will purify the church of immoralities, and will call down His Spirit, which will produce a revival and reformation.

Furthermore, this is the age in which Reason receives distinguished consideration. Reason is exalted. It unseats Jehovah and usurps His prerogatives. This may serve to illustrate: Reason says it cannot be that a merciful God will damn little children—infants. Then it grapples with the problem of the damnation of the heathen,

and concludes that a holy God cannot damn *them* forever, and that there *must* be opportunity for them to repent after death. To be consistent, Reason should take these positions also: God did wrong in permitting the entrance of sin; He does wrong in every infliction of punishment; He should be condemned, and is worthy of reprobation, for the awful judgments and scourges by which He has judged the race, and He should provide for the devil's opportunity to be saved. Thus Reason goes up and God goes down. This is one of the significant signs of the times. Men ask themselves, not God, what is right and what is wrong. They conclude what they want, and then affirm that the justice and mercy of God demand that He give it. Thus Satan to-day reproduces the scene in the Garden, and is causing some of national reputation, and many but less distinguished, to say to the unsanctified in Christian lands and to the heathen world, "*Thou shalt not die.*"

Many other things should be referred to in this connection, and with direct bearing on the subject in hand, and which show the "drift" from the "truth as it is in Jesus," but space forbids.

"This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come" (2 Tim. iii: 1).

CHAPTER II.

THE WITNESSING CHURCH.

THE term "witnessing" is used advisedly, but not to draw invidious distinctions. God has a witnessing church. The measurements by which this body is determined are not the popular ones, such as size, worldly honor, wealth, great institutions, world-wide fame, etc.; but the measurements of the Word of God. The term "witnessing" suggests gradation. And with this gradation, size, wealth, fame, have nothing to do: no more so than the size, the wealth, the fame of a witness in court. The whole question is one of knowledge and willingness to tell. In a trial before a jury there are principal witnesses. Some may know much about the cause in dispute. But if it be a question of murder, those who know even much are not sufficient. There must be witnesses who know the exact facts. These last are the PRINCIPAL WITNESSES, and may be properly spoken of as *the* witnesses who secured the condemnation or the release of the accused. The term "Witnessing Church" is used in this sense. Such church is the principal witness for the truth, and the whole truth. "Ye are my wit-

nesses." "Ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem." . . . "We are his witnesses unto the people." This enables us to better understand that passage in Rev. xi : 3 : "And I will give power unto my two witnesses, and they shall prophesy a thousand two hundred and threescore days, clothed in sackcloth. . . . And when they shall have finished their testimony, the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them. And their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt. . . . And after three days and a half the spirit of life from God entered into them, and they stood upon their feet ; and great fear fell upon them which saw them. And they heard a great voice from heaven saying unto them, Come up hither. And they ascended up to heaven in a cloud ; and their enemies beheld them."

This much debated passage cannot mean the destruction of the church, even for the brief space of three years and a half. It is believed that it is properly explained when it is made to refer to the decline of orthodoxy, decline in doctrinal soundness the "slaying of the witnesses" that stand for the WHOLE TRUTH, leaving all others. These witnesses, having been corrupted, and thus figuratively slain, are, by the

Spirit of God, after "three days and a half—" supposed to refer to years—raised again to their former position. This is set forth in these words: "They ascended up to heaven in a cloud ; and their enemies beheld them." They are brought back to the position of great influence and power. Whether the slaying of the witnesses is past, present, or to come, it is not the province of these pages to determine. But it is confidently believed that the Covenanter denomination can justly claim, above all others, to witness for the WHOLE TRUTH, in doctrine, worship, discipline and government ; in purity of conduct required ; in spirituality in the membership. It roots in the conflicts for truth in Scotland, where the bones of the fathers and martyrs mingle with the dust. It stands upon that same truth to-day which God blessed in rich abundance, and proclaims it to the world. No denomination witnesses for the kingly office of Christ as does the Covenanter. Others have the doctrine in their declaration of principles, and preach it in a modified form. But the Reformed Presbyterian Church preaches it and *practices* it. This last is the test of value. Covenanters witness for the absolute supremacy of Christ in church and state. The United States reject Christ and His authority. The Covenanter Church, alone from all other denominations, takes the witness stand, and gives testi-

mony before this nation that that is wrong ; that it will call down His judgments ; that war with the Son of God for possession of these dominions will be disastrous, and, in the end, destructive. The Covenanter Church is the PRINCIPAL WITNESS, and can justly receive the title, "Witnessing Church." Sister denominations, especially of the Presbyterian family, have made departures from the attainments of Reformation. They have given up truth. They have accepted error. The amount, in either department, is witnessed by the chasm between them and the old stock, Covenanters. If the term "witnesses" is rightly interpreted above, viz., those who hold the whole truth, these sister denominations can no longer claim the title, in that there is acknowledged and manifest departure in doctrine, worship and practice from the high attainments of the Reformation. But the Covenanter Church conserves these truths for which the martyrs died. It holds them amid some reproach and public condemnation. But this is only additional evidence to the truth held : "Ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake."

But the "Witnessing Church" is not without its dangers. The tide of liberalism, the latitudinarian views, the opinions and doctrines contrary to the established standards of faith, the heterodox theology, the sophistry of error, are causing

the tide to set hard against the old foundations. From the days of the Revolution Settlement, the little, staunch bark, which kept aloft the Blue Banner of the Covenant, has been buffeted by storm and tempest. Oft they have thought her sinking, but she rises above the roll of waters, and her voice is still heard above the angry billows, "FOR CHRIST'S CROWN AND COVENANT!"

She crossed the seas and planted the standard of the Mediatorial Dominion of Christ, and the purity of His worship. The varied experiences through which the denomination has passed in this land have been honorable, and reflect credit upon the descendants of a martyred ancestry. The trials of '33, when one-half the ministry and membership laid down their arms and ingloriously surrendered to the infidel State, were severe and searching. It left only the Gideon band of "three hundred." But men whose "hearts God had touched," they were like "the men of Judah, who clave to their king." They closed up the broken ranks; gave the work of the church thorough and systematic reorganization; and in unbounded confidence in the Most High and in Jesus their Redeemer and Lord, began, by the grace of God, converting, comforting and building up. The Head of the church greatly blessed their labors. So long as all eyes were fixed on the Son of God as the Supreme in church and

state, there was a peaceful and happy people. But of late years, especially during the last decade, there has been undisguised unrest. Questions settled long ago are again opened. By sophistry, and a political philosophy which can mean nothing if necessary, and yet be summoned to support the most heretical conclusions, these questions are again pressed.

The "Witnessing Church" is being, or is about to be, tried on these three among other lines: The temperance question in its political aspects; dissent as a term of communion; church union. These shall be considered, in the following pages, in the inverse order as named here. The denomination is already in the crucible in its political relations to the constitution in the matter of temperance. That "dissent" should be dethroned as a term of communion has been put forth in undisguised and open declaration. A new basis of church union, shrewedly discussed and with no little sophistry, has been repeatedly put before the church. "Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls" (Jer. vi: 16). "That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craft-

iness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive" (Eph. iv: 14). "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine, but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables" (2 Tim. iv: 3, 4).

CHAPTER III.

CHURCH UNION—THE STATE OF THE QUESTION.

At the present time, church union is exciting more or less attention. It is being discussed from many points of view. Church courts give deliverances. Ministers preach sermons. Editors write editorials. Views somewhat visionary and more or less impracticable are now and then put forth. For the most part, "church drift" is left out of calculation, but it is believed to be of serious importance in the final solution of the question of church union. Meantime, as showing the practical state of the question, let the following points be considered and remembered: *First.* Congregations in the same denomination still divide, and on trivial grounds.

People in the same congregation think they cannot worship together. They have become divided into parties. Each works for the supremacy. The friction becomes more and more intense and bitter and outspoken. At last they divide on a church site; the new building; the choice of a pastor; the election of elders; the congregation's change of location, etc., etc. This takes place in denominations and in congregations. In a congregation of a sister denomination in New York there was great strife for the greater part of a year. The point of difference was, "Should the congregation move seventeen or eighteen squares." Some said, yes, others, no. They divided. On pretexts of various kinds, members of the same denomination and of the same congregation have refused to dwell together and worship together. Nor would it appear that the children of God are sanctified from this evil to-day more than two generations ago. "Physician, heal thyself." This phase of the subject is important and significant.

Second. There is, perhaps, no denomination in which there is, in officers and members, *entire unanimity of views*. Diversity of opinion is more marked in some than in others. In some, relations are strained. There is, perhaps, in every denomination, the two parties—the *Liberal* and the *Conservative*. These have many things in com-

mon. They harmonize in much. But they differ. They differ energetically. The *Liberals* push ahead, the *Conservatives* hold back. An examination of the "down grade" movement in the Free Church, the Established Church, the Presbyterian Church, the United Presbyterian Church, etc., in Scotland, shows that every step was zealously opposed by the Conservative wing in these churches. But they were borne down. The Liberals carried the day by force of numbers. In the more orthodox churches in the United States there is plainly seen these opposing parties. In the Presbyterian, the impatient Liberals cannot go fast enough. They have already swept out of the way many things held dear by their predecessors. They are now directing their efforts against that time-honored bulwark of Christian liberty — THE CONFESSION OF FAITH. They openly declare war against some of the doctrines therein taught. These measures are opposed by the Conservative wing. They oppose energetically. The results cannot yet be determined. The Presbyterian Church, of seven hundred thousand members, may yet divide on the question of revision. In the United Presbyterian Church there has been discussion and discussion, agitation and agitation, crimination and recrimination, congregational divisions and divisions, over the instrumental music question. The Lib-

eral party say, "We will have them"; the Conservative, "You must not." Thus the strife goes on. Nor is it settled after seven years. The Conservatives must divide the denomination or submit to what they believe to be wrong. Either possibility does not witness to church union. In the Reformed Presbyterian denomination the Liberal and Conservative parties are marked. The Liberals are pushing on. The more advanced hold Liberal theories on church union. They advocate the use of the ballot to put the will of the people into law without recognition of Christ. They advocate the throwing open of pulpits to ministers of other denominations, which is, practically, but under disguise, "open communion." To these measures the Conservative party is opposed. They work energetically for the truth as it is in Jesus. They "earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints." They "stand in the way, and see, and ask for the old paths." It is not in place here to discuss the differences that exist *within* the various denominations, further than to give proof of their presence. This phase of the question of "church union" is not "full of promise." It is not even hopeful. There are almost as serious hindrances to union within denominations as without. For these elements of separation do not tend to remove themselves. It is a conflict of light

with darkness; of right with wrong; of error with truth. The present state of the question shows that "brethren do not dwell together in unity," even in the same denomination. This phase of the situation, in view of church union, is of serious consideration. "Physician, heal thyself."

Third. To throw all churches into one denomination, while in their present state, would be a calamity. There are more serious evils than the existence of denominations. One would be the church in her present imperfection without them. What gives rise to denominations? In a word, CONSCIENCE. They rise because men believe something; because they are willing to stand by that belief; to suffer for it if necessary; to preach it to the world, and to go to the judgment feeling that that is the very truth of God. What a blessing this devotion to truth has been to the world! "Truth forever on the scaffold, wrong forever on the throne," yet conscience, faith, belief, devotion to truth have led men and women and children to take their stand with truth on the scaffold. They have died in multitudes ever since the time of Christ. Not because they do not hold life dear, but because they hold the truth dearer. The world has stood in wonder and admiration. By their fidelity and suffering, truth has been preserved. It rose from the scaffold. It came forth

from the ashes of the stake. Filled with dauntless courage, and girded with invincible determination, they stood as the rocky crag in the mountain storm. That same spirit is in the church to-day. Men in Christian lands are not called upon to go to the stake or to the dungeon because of their belief, but they do feel called upon to separate themselves from error. And when the majority insist upon establishing error in doctrine, worship or government, conscience and fidelity to God-given and divinely imposed trust make it imperative that they come out and stand for the truth as it is in Jesus. This devotion to truth is an element in the church's vital energy. Take it away and the nerve has been cut.

Further : That which gives rise to divisions is itself the ground of hope that divisions will be removed. When we see men, women and children foregoing honor, preferment, worldly success, and willing to endure reproach for Christ and His truth, there is discovered in those very conditions the elements of character necessary to a united church. To throw all into one denomination, things being as now, would be a calamity, in that it would destroy this sense of private and public obligation to the Word of God. The outcome would be a church without bone or sinew or strength; it would be as weak as the theory upon which it would rest, and by which

it sought justification. We are glad there is grace in the church to divide, rather than become corrupt as a whole. The grace which refuses to be associated with error is that which works and builds up the cause of Christ. There is tendency in these last days to make little of doctrine. This is not an omen favorable to church union. The more intense the convictions, the more zealous for the truth, the brighter the prospects. The person most difficult to move is the man who believes but little. The same is true as to denominations. Leave denominations alone rather than throw them into one, believing as they do. It would be, in the opinion of the writer, the most serious harm.

Fourth. There is and has been a general and public recognition of Christian brotherhood and work among all the denominations. The writer has access to denominational literature in almost all the denominations. He has had the privilege of attending the highest church courts in some of them. Neither in the literature nor in deliverances of church courts do you find, what some advocates of union are pleased to term "fighting," "Stand by thyself, for I am holier than thou," "War to the knife and the knife to the hilt," as if Christians had nothing to do but bite and devour one another. The literature and deliverances of church courts in all the denomina-

tions dismiss as false such charge against their mutual respect and love. And when any minister, editor or writer makes such statement, he should be asked to "read up." There is recognition of Christian brotherhood everywhere. There is love between the denominations. There is common interest in Christ and in the success of His cause. The literature discloses nine times more bitter discussions between members of the same body. No. Although the church is sadly divided, and for which "there should be great searchings of heart," yet resources are not wasted in biting and devouring one another. *There are deep, abiding principles of love* between denominations. *There are earnest prayers for each other.* There is common interest in souls. When men, women and children are converted, whether by Methodist, Presbyterian, United Presbyterian, or Covenanter, there is joy throughout the whole household and family of Christ.

Further: It cannot be said, justly, that denominations hinder each other, no more so than *congregations of the same denomination.* Congregations of the same denomination often occupy the same territory. In every city where there are two or more congregations in the same body, they are, not sometimes, but every time, *thoroughly mixed together.* They are not divided geographically. *Thus two or more churches are sustained*

There is as much waste *within* denominational lines as because of them. Arguments produced as to denominational hindrances, can, with change of name, be applied to congregations of the same denomination occupying the same ground. "Physician, heal thyself."

CHAPTER IV.

CHURCH UNION.

THEORIES PROPOSED.

"UNION" is from the Latin, *unus*, one. The word may be used in two senses: 1st. Two or more things of different qualities and elements joined into one. Iron and brass may thus be joined. Yet each retains its own characteristics. The iron does not become brass, nor the brass iron. 2d. Having the requisite qualities, the things united become one in fact. Of churches, agreement of mind, will, spirit, affections. Church union is not desired under the first, but under the second. It contemplates a spiritual oneness, a flowing together, a "walking together" because "agreed." Putting denominations together on other basis would lead to strife and bitterness.

True union is desired. Let the following propositions, to this end, be noted:

AMERICAN EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

Of the plans for the reunion of Christendom, perhaps the proposal of the American Episcopal Church is the clearest and most concisely stated. It is grouped in these four:

"That, in the opinion of this Conference, the following Articles supply a basis on which approach may be by God's blessing made toward home reunion: (a) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as containing all things necessary to salvation, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; (b) The Apostles' Creed as the baptismal symbol, and the Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith; (c) The two sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Lord's Supper—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution, and of the elements ordained by Him; (d) The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His church."

THE PRESBYTERY OF NEW YORK (PRESBYTERIAN).

"Your Committee recommend that this Presbytery overture the General Assembly to invite the co-operation of the Presbyterian and Reform-

ed Churches of America and Great Britain and of Ireland to formulate a short and simple creed, couched so far as may be in Scriptural language, and containing all the essential and necessary articles of the Westminster Confession, which creed shall be submitted for approval and adoption as the common creed of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches of the world."

EMINENT MEN.

Dr. Patton, President of Princeton College, says:

"Those who advocate revision can perhaps be comprehended in three classes. 1st. Those who are Calvinists, and who ask only for a few changes, and for such as do not impair the integrity of the Calvinistic system. 2d. Those who, whether consciously or unconsciously, are not Calvinists and who make demands for a Revision which would impair the integrity of the Calvinistic system. 3d. Those who, whether Calvinistic or not, are Comprehensionists who are ready, in the interests of catholicity to see the Confession superseded by a shorter creed, or its doctrinal area greatly contracted."

Drs. Hastings and Schaff:

Some of the most scholarly, popular and widely known ministers in the Presbyterian Church, such as Drs. Hastings and Schaff, of Union

Theological Seminary, Dr. McCosh, ex-President of Princeton College, and others but less distinguished, advocate, "A brief, simple and popular creed, which shall briefly and tersely express, for laymen as well as ministers, only the cardinal doctrines of faith and duty."

UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

Some in the United Presbyterian Church urge that their "creed is too long, that men in this age of bustle and excitement cannot take time to study and digest it"; therefore a shorter one is to be desired. These views, somewhat modified, are held by a few in the Covenanter Church.

Two things, it is believed, are in the near future: 1st. A short creed which will leave out and pass over doctrines contested within or between denominations. 2d. Great effort will be made to unite the churches, especially those of the Presbyterian family, on this short creed.

Running through the opinions cited, there is a theory of church union. It takes definite form and comes plainly to view, in the terms proposed by the American Episcopal Church. But their terms are to be viewed with great suspicion. The Nicene Creed of fifteen centuries ago is a limited epitome of doctrine as developed up to date, but has nothing against the errors in doctrine or practice which have since appeared.

Furthermore, the Historic Episcopate is just what Presbyterians witness against. They suffered too much at the hands of Episcopacy two hundred and fifty years ago, to now peacefully drop into the tiger's mouth. The plan contemplates, also, the continuance of corrupt worship, liturgy, vestments, holy days, etc., etc. It is on the "giving up" plan. The "short, simple creed" is on the "giving up" plan. Advocates of union hope to solve the problem this way. Some propose a federation of denominations, something like our general government over the States, each denomination to retain its independent form and organization, with advisory powers committed to the federation. But this would not be church union, nor is it probable. The theory of a "short, simple creed" is the one commanding attention in the present day and condition of the church. It should be thoroughly studied. If right, it should be hailed with undisguised satisfaction; if wrong, the reasons assigned should be such as will satisfy thinking and conscientious people, and clearly based upon the Scriptures. The Comprehensionists would probably embrace by far the larger number in the Presbyterian Church who to-day desire revision. They would pare down the creeds and confessions until you have a common platform acceptable to all Christendom.

There are three serious objections to an attempt at church union on the theory proposed:

1st. *It would remove the bulwarks against error.* It is necessary in this connection to emphasize the growth of doctrine. In medicine, great progress has been made in the three centuries past. The nineteenth has witnessed more advance in the healing art than any. But there exists an ever operative necessity. New diseases, and old diseases in new forms, are ever appearing. The old remedies will not meet the necessities of the case. The new have been developed, in the providence of God, as the necessity for them arose. This will illustrate the growth of error, and the corresponding development of doctrine. "Sanctify them through thy truth." During the fourth and fifth centuries, there were great controversies over Christ's divinity and humanity. Strong factions arose which said He was not divine. Others, again, that He was not human. After long and heated discussions, the highest church courts condemned the errors concerning Christ's divinity and humanity. Pass down to the era of Luther and Knox. The error of justification by works had all but taken away the necessity of Christ's death. But God condemned the error, and published, emphasized and declared, through the reformers and the purified church, the doctrine of justification by

faith. The Pope claimed to be head of the church, as did the rulers in the British Isles. God condemned the error and set forth the Headship of Christ. As new diseases have developed, new medicines, which, indeed, always existed, but undiscovered, so errors, as they rise out of the unsanctified heart, have been made subservient to truth in this—they have made its development necessary. Thus God makes "the wrath of man to praise Him." The wealth of doctrine, gleaned from the Scriptures as set forth in the Confession of Faith and Testimony of the Covenanter Church, is traceable to this cause, as the very wars in which nations have engaged have developed a wealth of defensive and offensive material.

Given: These doctrines, developed through the ages in defense of truth and in opposition to error, what shall be done with them? Let it be remembered that error is operative always. It is the devil's artillery. It is planted and manned. The Scriptural doctrine raised up to combat the error is the means of defense. Shall it be removed? To do so would leave the church unprotected, in hostile surroundings. If the doctrine of Christ's humanity be removed as part of the confession of Christ's name on entering the communion of the church, then the adversary could "run in," through the disman-

tled fortress, those who would make havoc of the church. If the doctrine of justification by faith be removed as part of the confession of Christ's name, the church would be immediately corrupted. Along the coast of Holland, mighty dykes keep back the sea. These are, in places, fifty feet high. The tops of church steeples, in the low lands, would reach but the level of the waters. Those bulwarks are absolutely necessary. Take them away, and the waters would roll over city, town and country, in their mad career. Evil and sin piles up about the church on every hand. The wall to keep these out is the truth as it is in Jesus. To remove the truth would appear to be suicidal. To have church union on a few fundamental doctrines, would be to dismantle the great mass of fortifications which the church has builded these centuries. For the semi-evangelical churches to ask that a union be formed on the basis of a few fundamental doctrines, is like the wolves demanding of the sheep that the dogs be given up as the preliminaries to a lasting peace.

2d. *Such union would leave the church corrupt and without means of purification.* The church has, during all these thousands of years, suffered more from internal than external harm. A pure church is God's dwelling place, as witnesses the administration of the Covenant under the old dispen-

sation. Corrupt kings and a corrupt church were at the mercy of enemies. It was internal corruption which gave the church into the hands of the Chaldeans. Jerusalem was the scene of awful desolations and unutterable sorrows because of a corrupt church. This tendency to become internally corrupt is none the less marked in New Testament times. The Reformations witness to that fact. Wealth, luxury, ambition, worldliness, vice, these "have wounded her well-nigh to death, when she has been invincible against the scimiter of Mohammedan or the violence of Hun." In Reformation times, as on to the present, new sects, more or less fanatical, arose. They developed *within* the church. As in such cases, some truth would be held along with a mass of error. Sometimes there would be held but one heretical doctrine. In these times this growth of error within the church is plainly manifest. There are bodies of men who claim to be Christian, but who take Saturday for Sabbath, and speak of the enforcement of the Sabbath law as persecution. They work on the Lord's day and insist that this is right. Starting with pure worship at the Reformations, the growth of error within the church is marked. Hymns of human have displaced songs of Divine composition. The organ, the drum, the violin, the cornet, the flute, have well-nigh destroyed the voice of song in the

worship of God. Until thirty years ago the admission of slaveholders into the communion of the church was not, by nearly all the denominations, questioned. The brewer and saloon keeper are, to-day, admitted into many of them. The corruptions of oath-bound associations are by many denominations not considered wrong. To swear allegiance to a constitution which is barren of any recognition of God, or of the binding obligation of God's law, or of being bound to God's law as citizens and officers, is believed by Covenanters to be wrong, but is not questioned by the great body of Christians. The lines mentioned serve for illustration. Corruptions grow up within the church. The question is, What shall the church do? What is duty? What does God's Word say? What are the examples in the New Testament church, in the premises? It stands to reason that these errors cannot be left in the church. Evil within the church, as without it, tends to spread. "Evil men and seducers waxed worse and worse." Examples in the New Testament show that corrupters are not to be left in the church. "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which you have learned, *and avoid them*" (Rom. xvi:17). "If any man obey not our word by this epistle, *note that man*, and *have no company with him*, that he may be ashamed.

Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother" (2 Thes. iii:14). "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that *ye withdraw from every brother that walketh disorderly* and not after the tradition which he received from us" (2 Thes. iii:6). A charge is very solemn when delivered in the name of Christ. Such is this. There can be no doubt as to the duty here enjoined. The word "brother" makes the command refer to those who have been in church relation. And still a "brother," but one from whom the church must "withdraw." It is admitted on every hand that this refers to putting a "brother" under suspension, for holding error in doctrine or in practice. The other passages cited refer to the same duty. If these three passages are not authority for suspension, an hundred would not be. Let it be admitted, then, that "to suspend" is right. Put it stronger: To suspend is a command given by the church's Head. We are now ready for this statement, viz.: *A church court is limited in its exercise of discipline to that which legitimately falls within the "confession" in doctrine, worship and government of that particular denomination.*

Suppose a United Presbyterian should be "disciplined" for voting! He could not be, for voting is not recognized in their public confession, as wrong. Could a Presbyterian be sus-

pended for singing hymns? No; and for the reason the confessions of that branch of the church do not recognize that to be wrong. To do so by force would be ecclesiastical despotism. These serve to illustrate a very important truth. There must be a public confession co-extensive with the field in which discipline shall be exercised. And that public confession must be written out, in all its departments, and in simple language, else you have not dealt fairly and truly with the confessor.

The point in discussion, under this head, will now be understood: A UNION ON A FEW FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES WOULD LEAVE THE CHURCH CORRUPT AND WITHOUT MEANS OR POWER OF PURIFICATION. If any doctrine in the public profession be set aside, discipline within that field must be discontinued. If all doctrine but a few which wise heads have deemed "fundamental" be set aside, discipline as to errors in belief or practice must be discontinued, except within the limits of the "fundamental." It will be seen that this throws the church open to error, and leaves her at the mercy of the transgressor. Unsanctified men and women "could cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine," and "brothers could walk disorderly" and "obey not our word by this epistle," and the church would not have the power to "avoid them," "withdraw

from them" or "have no company with them." Not only, therefore, would the church be corrupted by this theory of church union, but the plain command of Christ would be disregarded, and His infinite wisdom questioned. To "withdraw from the brother who walketh disorderly" has been the history of the church during, and since the Reformations, as it was in times of the Apostles. But it rests upon the full and impartial public declaration of truth and duty set at the entrance door.

3d. *Church union on a few fundamental doctrines would be a rejection of the light, teaching, and work of the Holy Ghost, shed abroad through the church in all the New Testament era.*

The promise for New Testament times was, "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy; your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions" (Joel ii:28). The promise was fulfilled at Pentecost, and in the abundance of the Spirit, in the church, from that day to this. With this special outpouring of the Spirit, a work, not only in times of the Apostles, but in all the history of the New Testament church, is to be looked for, in keeping with the dignity, power and wisdom of the Holy Ghost. Such work is seen in the development of doctrine, worship, discipline and government, as well as in calling, converting and

sanctifying the multitudes of redeemed. To see the work of the Spirit in the development of truth, it is only necessary to realize how human nature fights every step upward in doctrine or practice. God is never in a hurry. So ages have been used in the work thus far. God permits His truth to "soak," if a familiar expression be allowed. No generation, perhaps, takes more than one step. Doctrine has been a slow but steady growth. Every now and then new forms of error arise. The devil makes a flank movement. Just now, the United Presbyterians in India are suffering from the inroads of Catholicism. In July, priests and nuns landed. Their plan is to proselyte the Protestant converts. By wiles and cunning and deceit, and outward show and pomp (to which human nature falls so willingly a prey) they are having astonishing success. The "Clerk's Newsletter," from India, says, "The Christians here, as yet, especially those of the villages affected, are very ignorant, and in regard to the Roman Catholic controversy practically know next to nothing. They become an easy prey to enemies as wily and deceptive as the agents of Rome." The coming of this unheralded and undesired enemy in the mission field in India will be of immense advantage in the development of resources. While the church may be taken by surprise, the Spirit is not. He permits

the church to feel the force of these errors, to show her the necessity of being purged from them. Then the Spirit leads to the armory of God, and furnishes His church with "weapons not carnal, but mighty." He develops from the Scriptures, doctrines which He lays as a wall about His people. To question the importance or necessity of this work is to question God's dealings with the church in the last eighteen hundred years. The wisdom of God called out the various providences which made the study of the Scriptures, in opposition to error, necessary. Thus the wealth of Scripture is revealed. As each new doctrine was set forth, it was, in nearly every instance, laid in the walls of the New Testament church, cemented with the blood of the most devoted followers of the Lamb, those with the heart to believe and the courage to declare. Indeed, almost every step in the development of doctrine has been through the fires of persecution, the blood of the scaffold, the dungeon, and unutterable sorrows. Thus the Spirit has led the church. But we look back and thank God, grateful that we enter into the fruits of their sorrows and the heritage of their fidelity; for in this is our peace. But shall these fortresses "in opposition to error and in defense of truth" be given up—*all excepting a few deemed to be* FUNDAMENTAL? Shall the saints in one age die for what may now be lightly cast aside? Shall

the Spirit labor thus for eighteen hundred years to see His church now forsake the positions to which He has led her? Will the saints of God be thus betrayed into a union which so dishonors the Holy Ghost? A half-dozen fundamental doctrines, forsooth, and all else of the work of the Spirit left to be preached, practiced, believed, etc., as the individual sees fit! And this to be called "*church union*"! "Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon, lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice, lest the daughters of the uncircumsized triumph!" "The bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it; and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it" (Isaiah xxviii:20). Such dishonor to the Spirit and His work and light and teaching for the last eighteen hundred years will not be permitted by the followers of Christ! It should be remarked, here, that some of those who propose church union on the basis of a few fundamental doctrines, would say that other doctrines, the vast bulk of the creeds and confessions of Christendom, should be set forth as "testimony" by the church, but not demanded of the confessor in his public confession. But who, even though the theory should prevail, shall determine what is to go into this "testimony"? It would of necessity be determined by a congress of denominations.

Is it probable that Baptists would admit into such "testimony" the right of infant baptism? If not, would the Presbyterian family of churches yield? Is it probable that the Methodist family would admit the doctrine of a definite atonement? What would the congress of churches do again? Is it to be supposed that the Presbyterian, Methodist, Lutheran, Baptist Churches would admit into that "testimony" the duty of singing God's songs ONLY, in worship? Would United Presbyterians and Covenanters yield? Would the "testimony" against secrect societies be admitted? Would Covenanters yield for the sake of union? Would belief of the Covenanter Church, in the matter of dissent and protest against the godless constitution of the United States, be permitted in that "testimony"? In all denominations there are devoted Christian men whose honesty would not permit them to set forth, as the "testimony of the church," that which they do not believe. The "testimony of the church" could not, therefore, rise higher than the few fundamental principles which could be agreed upon as the basis of union.

"If in the interests of comprehension," says Dr. Patton, "the work of revision is to go on, where will it stop? Shall we strike out everything but what is common to evangelical Christians? That seems to be a feasible thing. But

is anybody prepared to state the *consensus* of evangelical doctrine? Will you widen your doctrinal area until the profession of Christian faith becomes the only condition of ministerial fellowship? Will you accept, for instance, the Apostles' Creed as your ecclesiastical symbol? And what would be the result? We should gain in numbers, but LOSE IN MORAL POWER. We give up doctrine. What is to save the denomination from disintegration? We should be no nearer the reunion of Christendom. Episcopacy would still be on our right, congregationalism on our left, and for the sake of a Utopian scheme of visible unity, that has no support in Scripture and no analogy in experience, we should have lost the glorious heritage of three hundred years."

The eminent Doctor goes on to show that comprehension could not stop its minimizing tendency at the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments. Some would insist on rejecting one thing, and some another; some inspiration; some the authority of Scripture, until a veritable Robert Elsmere could be licensed and ordained without debate. He then adds: "This is not the scheme that any one proposes to-day, but this is the logical outcome of comprehension.

"And now I ask, Is it a church like this that is

fit to cope with Romanism? Can such a church prove a breakwater to the floods of infidelity?

"Let me not be misunderstood. I believe that there is a common work of evangelization in which the denominations can co-operate. I believe that Christians of different churches should love each other more and understand each other better. BUT THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM, as that phrase is commonly understood, I DO NOT BELIEVE IN. [Small capitals ours.] It is quite true that the doctrines which Christians hold in common are more important than those which separate them. BUT THE WAY TO CONSERVE THAT WHICH IS COMMON TO ALL, IS FOR EACH TO BE JEALOUS FOR THE DOCTRINE THAT IS PECULIAR TO ITSELF. DEFEND THE OUTPOSTS IF YOU WISH TO DEFEND THE CITADEL."—*Rev. Francis L. Patton, D. D., LL. D., Pres. of Princeton College.*

Dr. Patton is one of the very best authorities in the great Presbyterian Church. His forceful words concerning "minimizing" doctrine, giving up truth, for the sake of union, the comprehensionist's tendency toward infidelity, his warning to guard the "outposts" if the "citadel" would not be finally surrendered, are worthy of the most careful consideration. If what he sets forth be true, the principle is as applicable to the Covenanter Church, and it is urged, by all the force of his powerful logic and Scriptural

conclusions, to maintain its doctrine, worship, discipline and government in strict and conscientious integrity. Union cannot be by the surrender of "a jot or tittle" of all that the Lord hath spoken.

CHAPTER V.

CHURCH UNION CONTINUED.

THE TRUE BASIS.

CHURCH union is possible, as the preceding chapter would suggest, only on an exhaustive publication, declaration and confession of TRUTH and DUTY, as set forth in the Word of God.

The old Scotch standard bearer, who, in his enthusiasm, pushed on ahead of the column, was ordered to bring the standards back to the regiment. His heroic spirit was seen in his answer: "Bring the regiment up to the standards!" God's standard never retreats. His measuring rule is never shortened. Truth once set forth, by the teachings of the Spirit in the church, can never be put back into the mines from whence it was digged. Sections of the church may be-

come corrupt, as in the dark ages, but the highest standard of truth yet reached is, at that very time, maintained by the Waldensian Church, amid the fastnesses of the Alps. It is believed that large bodies of the church, since the Reformations, have forsaken positions once held and truth once believed. But the highest standard of truth, reached in Reformation times, is witnessed in the Covenanter denomination. No. God's standard never retreats. This should be taken into consideration in any theory of church union. "Bring back the nineteenth century, as exemplified in Christian and enlightened nations, to the standards of antiquity," says the heathen devotee. Impossible! As well attempt to put back Niagara! THAT CHURCH UNION IS POSSIBLE ONLY ON AN EXHAUSTIVE PUBLICATION, DECLARATION AND CONFESSION OF TRUTH AND DUTY, AS SET FORTH IN THE WORD OF GOD, is believed for these reasons:

1st. From the apparent providential indications, as witnesseth the growth of doctrine, that *God has in view the full exhibition of the riches of* His Word; and that holding these truths in the profession, confession and practice of the church, as the Spirit reveals them, *is the means to this end.* The great truths of the Godhead and of redemption, of heaven and of hell, the punishment of sin and forgiveness through

Christ, the administration of the Covenant under the Old Testament, and under the New, Christ's offices of Prophet, Priest and King, the application of doctrine to conduct, etc.—these have been fields of controversy in which the battle fiercely raged. But there has been continual progress. Along this line of development of doctrine and duty the denominations are scattered just as the nations are scattered along the line of progressive civilization. Some more, some less advanced. Providential indications point to the civilization and enlightenment of all the nations of the world, and up to the highest standard. Thus it is with the truth of God. From what has taken place in the past there is every reason to believe that God means "to bring the church up to the standard" of truth revealed. And more: That He will continue to exhibit truths revealed, but yet unlearned, until there has been the fullest glory to God's wisdom, in this department, on earth. This being admitted, what is the church's duty in the premises? Surely this, to follow the leadings of God's Spirit; to accept truth at His hands; to build it into the church's standards, and to require its public profession and confession by the disciples of Christ. For the church to thus espouse the truth, preach it, labor for it, profess it, practice it, is the only means known to the writer

to spread the truth. This effectually does it. There were persecutions, but "they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine." When Vicksburgh was captured, the Confederate flag floated from the top of the highest church steeple in the city. Presently a Union soldier was seen ascending with the stars and stripes. He nailed on cleet after cleet until he reached the dizzy height, and tearing away the emblem of rebellion, he flung to the breeze the flag of our country! He reached that height by going up step after step, nailed fast. Thus the standard of Christ goes up as the truth of God is laid in profession and practice in the walls of Zion, cemented, if necessary, with the blood of the saints.

If God, therefore, means to thus display His truth, and if the means to this end is to put the truth in the church's standards, it is manifest that church union may not be expected on compromise measures. It can be but on the fullest expression, avowal, and entering into covenant with the whole truth as it is in Jesus. We put it stronger thus: *To abandon a truth, in confession or practice, is a step in opposition to church union.* It is tearing down, not building up; pointing backward, not forward; away from Christ instead of to Him. If there be one consideration, above another, which should

eloquently appeal to Covenanters to stand by their profession and practice, it is that just stated. There is wrapped in it the interests of generations to come, and the spread of the glory of the Redeemer's name.

2d. Without such exhaustive publication, declaration and confession of truth and duty as set forth in the Word of God, *union in sentiment or worship is impossible.* This is so manifest that it needs but brief illustration. In a town of one thousand people there are congregations of Methodists, Lutherans, Baptists, Presbyterians, United Presbyterians and Covenanters. Suppose that union, on other basis than that maintained as the only one, in this discussion, be tried. Suppose that these congregations would number six hundred, all told. The order passes along the line that all these branches of the church have united and will meet for worship in the largest church building. If a Presbyterian wants his child baptized, and the minister happens to be a Baptist, what shall be done? In another town a Lutheran minister is the pastor. On communion day he preaches "transubstantiation"—that the bread and wine are converted into the real body and blood of Christ. What shall be done about it? In another town a Presbyterian is minister. He gives out hymns, but the United Presbyterian and Covenanter believe that to be wrong,

What shall they do? Forever give up singing in the House of God? They must, or go and worship to themselves. In another town a United Presbyterian is minister. He preaches the duty of becoming citizens and swearing allegiance to the constitution and voting for officers, though the constitution does not own the Most High. What will the Covenanters do? Will they give up that truth? Will they raise their children in such spiritual surroundings? It is plain to any one who wishes to look at the matter sensibly that these people could not worship together. It is not to be supposed that conscientious men will do violence to their conscience in this way. Enthusiasts on union might, for they are, for the most part, of elastic material. But men who fear God, and who feel the duty of maintaining the truth, and having it preached, in its purity, would not. Look at the situation from another point of view. Suppose a Covenanter was the preacher of the supposed congregation. Would he be allowed to preach the truth as held by the Covenanter Church as to purity of worship? As to dissent from government, etc.? Would he be permitted to go into homes and instruct the children in these? Is it not manifest that church union on this basis is visionary? It looks in the wrong direction. It ministers to evil and error.

It is on a plane away down. Let it be dismissed. A plan of church union, capable of being executed is diametrically opposed to compromise. When the great congregation goes out to worship God, like Israel going out of Egypt, "not a hoof must be left behind" of truth and duty.

In fine: If the conclusions arrived at in the preceding discussions be correct:

1st. There are no true indications of church union at present.

2d. The plane of church union is up, not down, and is, perhaps, not yet reached by the most advanced denomination.

3d. The Covenanter denomination is in the line of duty when it strictly maintains the truth revealed by the Spirit and set forth in its standards.

4th. To so maintain the truth in profession, confession and practice *is working for, and is leading on and up to*, CHURCH UNION.

CHAPTER VI.

THE WITNESSING CHURCH AND "OPEN PULPITS."

THESE are strange times. The Congregationalist is settled over a Presbyterian congregation. A Presbyterian is settled over a Congregational charge. Methodists and Presbyterians and United Presbyterians exchange pulpits. All meet together in union services. There was a time when these things were not, but they are now, and common. These also commune together, excepting possibly the last-named church. It must be admitted that these denominations have among themselves almost destroyed denominational lines. They have made them so indistinct that they are practically zero. Furthermore, it must be admitted that they have lost all influence upon each other. They have no purifying power among themselves. They contaminate each other with doctrinal corruption, and reduce themselves to a common level, and that, the level of the lowest. Nor can they lift converts to a higher standard than the lowest positions occupied by any of these churches.

They have, therefore, lost much and gained nothing. That these by "open pulpits" exhibit a greater love than others, is denied. That they show less love is affirmed.

The Witnessing Church has a history in the matter of "open pulpits." It commenced in Scotland, when men's souls were tried for the truth. They stood like the rock when others forsook the truth. They solemnly called upon these brethren to return to the "truth as it is in Jesus." At the same time they testified against them, and held them "to be covenant breakers." In this land the same high position was held, is held, and will continue to be held by the Witnessing Church. God will not permit it to be given up, for it guards purity of doctrine, strengthens the foundations of the truth, buttresses the citadel against error, and holds before the world a higher position, whose honors cannot be stolen, while its doctrines are rejected.

The Synod of 1877 had before them three memorials from these sessions: Second New York, Fourth New York, and Coldenham, all on the subject of "interchange of pulpits." These memorials, although not printed, were, it is believed, addressed to Synod in the interests of the historic position of the church, which is—no interchange. They were called out by transgression. The special committee to consider and report

on these memorials consisted of Dr. J. R. W. Sloane, Dr. Thomas Sproull, Dr. H. P. McClurkin, with Elders Kirkpatrick and Lamont. This committee will be recognized as exceptionally strong. The following is their report, and which was adopted by Synod :

"The special committee to which were referred certain petitions relating to inviting clergymen of other denominations to minister to our people in the preaching of the Word, report :

"I. That, while desiring to cultivate and cherish the most friendly and fraternal relations with our brethren of other evangelical denominations, *it has never been the custom of the church* to invite them to minister to our people in the preaching of the Word. [*Italics ours.*]

"II. That we see no good reason, in the present condition of the visible church of Christ, for departing from existing usage."

In this two things are clearly set forth : 1st. "It has never been the custom of the church" to invite clergymen of other denominations to preach in Covenanter pulpits. 2d. That in the judgment of the committee, and of Synod, there is no good reason for doing so now. The *first* carries with it the cumulative force of the position of the church in all its past history. This is no small matter. Indeed, it is of such import-

ance that it may be a question of ecclesiastical law whether Synod has the power to effect a change, but by overture. The *second* calls attention to the visible body of Christ, and says : "We see no good reason for departing from existing usage." There were bad reasons quite enough, but NO good ones. This is a broad statement. We are glad to know that the committee who formulated and presented the report, and which Synod adopted, were men in whom there is confidence, who could not be imposed upon, and who would not impose upon others, who would not make a report NOT AGREEABLE TO THE FACTS.

The past history of the church, therefore, and up to the present hour, is clear as mathematical demonstration. There are no deliverances of doubtful interpretation. The line of battle is strong and clearly defined. For the denomination to "change front" on the question of "interchange of pulpits" is a matter, therefore, of serious consideration, since it would be the forsaking of a position held from the Reformation to the present hour.

But a resolution is now on Synod's table looking to the overthrow of this time-honored and Scriptural position. The resolution reads :

"*Resolved*, That our ministers be permitted to extend invitations to ministers of other evangelical denominations to occupy our pulpits, where

they are known to be in sympathy with our movements on reform."

This resolution, as congressmen would say, has a "rider." It means simply interchange of pulpits, in the broadest sense. But it seeks favor, and tries to disarm criticism by the added clause: "Where they are known to be in sympathy with our movements on reform."

Shall Christians, Baptists, Methodists, Lutherans, Presbyterians, United Brethren, etc., be invited to "occupy our pulpits"? That is the question. Shall the policy of the church be changed? Shall the historic position be given up? The following considerations are presented:

I. *It would discrown the denomination as the Witnessing Church.*

Covenanters witness against "the corrupt constitutions of both church and state." They witness against all who partake in these corruptions. They separate from a corrupt state and from a corrupt church. The standing declaration in the testimony is, "We condemn the following errors and testify against all who maintain them." Shall those against whom "we testify," and who hold "errors condemned," be invited to administer the ordinances? If so, it is a surrender to these errors, and those parts of the testimony should be stricken out;

for Synod puts teachers in the pulpit who reject, and who are known to reject, the truth. It would, in the eyes of all Christendom, reduce the Witnessing Church to the common level.

II. *Interchange of pulpits brings all, finally, to the same level.*

Those churches which have had interchange of pulpits for a generation are now on practically the same level. Presbyterians are beginning to feel that their Calvinism is too strong. They want rid of it. There is a common level in practice. It matters little what you believe or what you do not believe in any of these churches. Other results could not be expected. If they were becoming stronger in doctrine, purer in worship, the resolution on Synod's table might have a stronger plea. But what is the situation? When the United Presbyterians are corrupting their worship; when Presbyterians have thrown the confession into the crucible; when the standard everywhere is being let down, a resolution to allow them to administer the ordinances is introduced! At the time when God and the interests of humanity ask for the most faithful testimony, when the retrograding churches need to be shown their errors, there arise those who say, "THE TIMES DEMAND THAT THE STANDARD BE LOWERED!" Is this the way to bring those churches up? Is it the way to

reform? There is a feeling every now and then expressed that the reforms are just ready to be crowned with success. It would appear that this feeling is produced more by the way things are looked at now. Something like Pope says of vice seen too oft, "we first pity, then endure, then embrace." The supposed success results more from change in the reformers than in the thing to be reformed. These efforts to lower the standards are witnesses whose testimony is not easily impeached.

Furthermore, for a Covenanter congregation to have the ordinances administered by a United Brethren, a Presbyterian, a Methodist, a Lutheran, strikes their distinctive principles a terrible blow. Not an offensive word may be spoken, but the moral effect is the same. The bayonet is seldom used in war, but its moral effect is an ever-present power.

III. Ministers of other denominations should not be allowed to administer the ordinances in Covenanter pulpits because *they are under informal suspension.*

A minister in the Reformed Presbyterian Church, voting, holding office, using hymns or instrumental music in worship, joining a secret society, etc., is immediately, on proof thereof, suspended by the Presbytery. He is not allowed to minister to the congregations of

the church. He is not allowed to commune. Suppose that a minister thus under suspension should go to, and be received by, some other denomination, which would not recognize the right of suspension under the circumstances, and which would admit him, though a letter of standing stated that he is under suspension. That minister could, *through interchange of pulpits*, come again into the pulpits of the denomination and minister to the people. But this minister, having voted, joined secret societies, etc., is doing what Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists, Lutherans, etc., do. *They* are, therefore, INFORMALLY SUSPENDED. To admit ministers of other denominations to pulpits is to have the ordinances administered by those under discipline. This defeats the objects of discipline in Christ's house. If a Covenanter minister is suspended, he should remain under that suspension, so far as the denomination is concerned, until it is removed by the proper court. If he is not allowed to minister to Covenanter congregations while under suspension, simply because he declines the jurisdiction of the court by going elsewhere, should not entitle him to do so. This is both common sense and ecclesiastical law. (See Case Hetherington's His. of Ch. of Scot., pp. 433–6.)

But if it be right to say that he shall not

administer the ordinances because he has violated the principles of the church, it would be wrong to admit other ministers who DO EXACTLY THE SAME THING. He is under formal, they informal, suspension. The one is not entitled to more privileges than the other. To admit either is to agree that the authority which Christ solemnly committed to His church has been improperly used; or, having been properly used, it can be made a mockery.

What saith the Scriptures? "Withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly." The Covenanter Church has solemnly done so in the matter of instrumental music, hymn singing, swearing allegiance to the constitution, secret societies, etc. While they continue to "walk disorderly," shall they be given the close, official fellowship of the pulpit? "We have not so learned Christ."

IV. The FORMULA OF QUERIES, put to the Covenanter minister at his ordination, and *which he is required to publicly accept and sign in constituted court*, make it profoundly inconsistent to admit ministers, who decline to accept these, to preach the Word in the pulpits of the denomination. These queries are for the special purpose of strictly guarding the purity of God's house. They are exceptionally strong, clear and righteous. If, at ordination, a minister in the Coven-

anter body refused to accept them, and bind himself by them, he would not be ordained by the church court, nor would he be permitted to preach in the pulpits of the denomination. Shall a premium be put on belonging to other denominations? Shall privileges be granted them which are denied those within the fold? Shall our ministers be bound to preach pure doctrine; in the presence of Christ in His constituted court be required to *say so and sign the public guarantee;* and then those who publicly profess doctrines directly subversive to the principles and practices of the church be invited to minister in the preaching of the Word?

If, twelve years ago, there was "no good reason" that the historic position of the denomination be forsaken, in this matter, there would appear to have arisen no good reason since. On the other hand, these days of liberal thinking and latitudinarian views, when the church is gradually drifting away from the old landmarks, when the English Presbyterian, the Scotch United Presbyterian, the Free Church and the Presbyterian Church in this land, are forsaking and casting down the attainments of the Reformation, when the United Presbyterian Church has corrupted and is corrupting its worship by the introduction of instrumental music, when the practices of Christian people in the keeping of

God's commands were never more corrupt since the Reformation than now, when all forms of heresy and practices are sheltered in the visible church; these are not the times to throw open the pulpits of the church of the Covenants, but to make the marks of separation more distinct, and to bear the most faithful testimony to doctrine, worship, discipline and government, as established by the Lord Jesus Christ.

The words of Dr. S. O. Wylie, whose conclusions were never hasty, but reached through conscientious and thorough investigation, are of special value on this question. In a discussion of "Interchange of Pulpits," in the October number Ref. Pres. and Cov., 1877, he closes thus:

"We add as an expression of profound conviction that if the Reformed Presbyterian Church exists at all, she must exist as she has hitherto done —a public witness against corrupt constitutions in both church and state, and refusing the fellowship of approval to the one the same as to the other. She has no right to exist unless she does so,for the reason that she is without a mission as a separate organization. Something has been said by those who are seeking to justify the new departure about all holding on to and being of one mind in regard to the great principles of the church, as if it was not as much a great principle of the Covenanting Church to maintain a position of dis-

sent from an unscripturally organized church as from an unscripturally organized state. The principle which covers both cases is the same, and of short time, too, when the practice will assimilate on both points, or else history is a falsehood, and observation and experience in connection with both past and present are wholly unreliable guides."

CHAPTER VII.

IS THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH AN EVANGELISTIC CHURCH?

If the Reformed Presbyterian Church can go into a union only on the fullest presentation and acceptance of the truth, and as there is but little hope of union on such basis at the present, the question becomes as interesting as it is important, Is the Covenanter Church evangelistic? If not, it should cease to exist; if it is, it should strictly and conscientiously maintain its organization, and push the work of God with all its energies and resources. It should, in these "perilous times," plead with God for a larger

baptism of the Holy Ghost. It should "attempt great things for God, and should expect great things of God."

Substituting Webster's definition for evangelistic, the question may be stated, Is the Covenanter Church designed or fitted to instruct in the Gospel; to preach Christ; to convert to a belief of the Gospel?

This suggests two things: *First*, Is the Covenanter Church equipped for the work? *Second*, Does the Covenanter Church do this work?

There are three things necessary to the conditions of the first: *The Commission; The Message; The Spirit.* If these are found, the church is equipped for the work. An extended discussion of these three, in this connection, is unnecessary. A statement will be found sufficient.

1st. The Commission. The branch of the church to which the denomination under consideration belongs, reaches back to the Reformations, and has its roots firmly imbedded in the Covenants. It has an unbroken line. Others are off-shoots of later times. If any of the many denominations can claim the "commission," the Covenanter Church can.

2d. The Message. The message which this denomination carries is as broad and deep and high as the Word of God. It is the same message and Word preached by Luther, Calvin and

Knox, as they grappled with the errors and immoral institutions and spiritual wickedness of those times. It is the same Gospel preached by the Apostles as they went forth, single handed, to the heart of idolatry and superstition. It is the same Gospel preached by Christ Himself in the years of His minsitry, and spoken through inspired men in after years. It is this Gospel which the Covenanter Church witnesses to and proclaims. It will be admitted that the truth is held more consistently, preached more conscientiously, and fully, than by sister denominations. It holds its members to a more conscientious regard for truth and duty. It insists upon lines of conduct, believed to be Scriptural and required, but rejected by other denominations. It maintains the ordinances in their apostolic purity. The Reformed Presbyterian Church yields to no denomination in the determination to proclaim the whole Gospel of the Son of God.

3d. The Spirit. Has the Covenanter Church the Spirit? If not, it has lost it since the Reformations, for it had the Spirit then. By whose power were those mighty works accomplished? Whose might spiritually revolutionized Scotland? The little band of reformers, what were they among so many? The conventicles hidden away in the mountains, what could they do? It was the Spirit working through the Word which did

those mighty works. The same Spirit that raised Lazarus, and overturned Rome-Pagan. The overthrow of the spiritual despotism fastened upon Scotland required Almighty power. It was given, and through the Covenants. But has the Spirit been lost since? Has God left the Covenanter Church? Has He ceased to bless it and its work? We unhesitatingly answer, No. We put it stronger. For it is believed that there is special manifestation of the Spirit's presence in the Covenanter Church in that there is, in this denomination, a greater number of saints, according to the membership, than in others. This is our conviction after years of observation. These things testify to the presence of the Head of the church. The denomination is, therefore, girded with the armor of God for the work of evangelization.

II. *Is Evangelistic Work Done?* The denomination may be designed and fitted to instruct in the Gospel, but does it instruct? It may be designed to convert, but does it convert? Is the Reformed Presbyterian Church doing evangelistic work? It is necessary that there should be clear thinking here. According to Webster's definition of "evangelistic," churches which preach the truth and regularly maintain the ordinances, and bring souls into the kingdom, are evangelistic. From this point of view, all the

congregations in the denomination are doing evangelistic work. And the fact that a new congregation is built up every thirty-three years (a generation) and that this process has been going on for seventy-five or an hundred years, where congregations have been established so long, shows that the denomination has been successful in doing the work designed. More still; the number of congregations now, as compared with fifty years ago, shows that the denomination has had a healthy and strong growth. New congregations have been formed all along the line. If even the Reformed Presbyterian Church could keep up this pace as in the last fifty years, it would be only a question of time until the world would be converted, and not so long a time as might at first be supposed. The training of these souls and generations for heaven, converting them through the Gospel, sanctifying them through the Truth, causing them, in turn, to take up the burdens laid down by others, marshaling them in the army of the Son of God, this is a work of vast importance and attended by everlasting results. It testifies that the denomination is doing the work designed.

But look at what is being done outside of congregations, and beyond their reach. As a basis to all work, there must be contributions. Nothing can be done without money. The amount

of money contributed is a good measure of work done. Among the denominations, not one in the matter of contributions, so far as learned, stands up with the Reformed Presbyterian Church, which gives $19.75 per member. With this presumption in favor of the church under consideration, look at the field of operations. Through this the evangelistic work of the church is seen.

In the *Foreign* field, it is no longer a question of opportunity, but the number of men the church can send. The open doors and the Macedonian cry have become the astonishment of even the missionaries themselves. A good, honest look at the churches, mission and preaching stations and schools in Syria and Asia Minor, should revive the drooping spirits of those who think the Covenanter Church is not designed to convert and is not converting! In a most bigoted nation, and in the face of the most determined opposition, these results have been achieved. In the Latakia Mission, they have 186 native members. They had an increase of 37 communicants last year. How many congregations at home can report a like increase, and with a nominally Christian community all around them? They have 25 schools in that district. They have 735 pupils. They have 18 Sabbath-schools with an aggregate of 643 scholars. The Mersine district, although

occupied but a few years, can give figures equally favorable for length of time. God is blessing the work.

With change of name, like things can be said of the *Southern* mission. Half a dozen ministers could be placed in most advantageous positions, with most encouraging surroundings, and with most promising outlook. The prayer of the workers is, "Give us more men." They want more reapers, for the harvest is ripe. A congregation of fourscore, grown out of nothing, in a few years! And by converting a people whose strong inclination would be to reject truth which they have espoused! That a congregation of eighty can be gathered in fifteen years, and be held to their duty amid all the political excitement of the times, is remarkable! It establishes the proposition under discussion in these pages. "What need of further witness?" But no doubt some who wish to throw off the distinctive principles, under cover that we can't evangelize, holding them, will say, "Yes, but they are only *colored* people!" Very true; and it is only *white* people who, having been raised under the most favorable circumstances, reject such plain evidence.

Take a hasty glance at the *mission* among the Chinese, and the *mission* among the Indians. The tide is against the former, in that they have

to do with a people without a fixed habitation. But, with this discouraging feature, there is marked progress in winning souls. Every now and then, a Mongolian, whose ancestors for an hundred generations licked the dust of idolatrous superstition, and rendered unquestioned devotion to their senseless rites, turns his back forever upon idols, and seeks baptism, repentance and forgiveness through the blood of the Son of God. What cause for thanksgiving! Let God be praised, blessed be His glorious name!

The *Indian* Mission, so lately located, has had, as yet, no opportunity to reap. But the devoted missionary and his no less devoted wife to this great cause, have already fringed with gold the dark picture of Indian degradation. There is most encouraging and promising outlook. The obligation to the Red man resting on the Covernanter Church is beginning to be discharged. May God smile upon the auspicious beginnings and forward the Gospel among the Aborigines of America!

Once more: look at *national reform* work pushed so energetically by the Covenanter Church. Look at the Secretaries in their indefatigable labors. Look at the doors wide open and the willing ears to hear. What denomination is evangelizing the nation with the great truths of Christ's mediatorial dominion, spend-

ing men and money, as is the Reformed Presbyterian? The burden of that work still rests upon the church under consideration. The great proportion of the money comes from it. It contributes the necessary zeal. It has faith in the righteous cause.

Of this work we say two things: 1st. No denomination is evangelizing the nation with these truths as is the Covenanter. It began and carries forward the work. 2d. The life of that work depends upon the continued existence of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. Whatever tends to destroy faith in the distinctive position of the denomination in reference to governments which reject God and disown His law, tends to eventually stop the work of national reform. If the denomination's work outside of its congregations was confined to this one effort, the enthroning of Christ and His law in this nation, there would still be no denomination doing more efficient and necessary evangelistic work.

In fine (for we cannot notice particulars farther) look at the Sabbath-school work of the denomination. It is as efficient and successful as in any. Look at the schools in connection with congregations. Look at the number of mission schools sustained by congregations. Look at the preaching in connection with these. We are prepared to say that the Reformed Presbyterian

Church has as efficient Sabbath-schools, with as large per cent. of mission scholars, as sister denominations ; probably more. These schools do good work and bring many into the church. Mind comes in contact with mind. Thought and life are moulded. Souls are saved. This department of church work is practically without limitation. And any failure to improve the opportunity is the fault of the workers, which would follow them into whatsoever denomination.

The suggestions made on the various lines through which the operations of the church are conducted, remove all reasonable doubts, and put the question beyond successful contradiction, that the Reformed Presbyterian Church is an evangelistic church. There are more doors than can be entered ; more calls than can be answered. The three thousand who stepped out in '33 were converted through the instrumentality of the Covenanter Church. In the following generation, the denomination was the instrument in converting three thousand to make up this loss, and three thousand more to replace the dead. Here is a net gain of an hundred per cent. in a generation. The dropping away to sister denominations during the years does not argue against the *converting* power. None more quickly than those who have made their spirit-

ual home elsewhere, would resent the implication that they were not converted. But, if converted, it was through the instrumentality of the mother church. They should, therefore, deal very kindly with the denomination which God honored in rescuing them from the pit.

A brother whose long acquaintance with the field entitles his opinion to consideration said, in substance, that if all the Covenanters had remained in the church, in New York City, there would be seven large congregations. This is probably true. And it shows that God blesses the denomination as a converting instrument. Why these leave and go elsewhere, after being born into the kingdom, is another question which will come up for solution farther on.

If there be no difficulties with which to contend but those without, no hindrances to meet but those which the unconverted present, the denomination has great reason, standing in the midst of such blessed opportunities and with such evidence, up to the present, of God's favor, to go joyfully forward, with ever abounding faith.

But just here we meet the movement popularly known as "evangelistic work" in the churches at the present day: and it is quickly asked, "Does our church do *this* work?" In the first place, let me say, these popular evangelistic movements

are not the solid, lasting work of the church. The lasting work is found in the lines mentioned above. These are the deep, quiet stream, which bears on its bosom the great multitude of souls to the throne of God. And when you find anybody condemning as too slow and out of date these tried and useful and successful methods, you may be sure he is taking to shallow water. Enthusiastic admirers of new and gushing methods (they should read an article contributed to the *Interior*, by Rev. Geo. P. Hays, on this subject) sometimes lay the blame of partial failure on the truth the church holds, or our manner of worship. At the last Synod, the version of the Psalms which had sung seven generations of the best saints the world has seen, to heaven, was held up and spoken of as a hindrance. Alas for such superficial views! But what is known as popular evangelistic services have their place in the Covenanter Church, and probably quite as extensively, in proportion to the membership, as in sister denominations. Souls are undoubtedly reached through these. What we do object to is that truth held since the Covenants, and wrought into the life of the church by persecution to the death, and which has been the bulwark of religious liberty from that day to this, should now be condemned by popular movements of the last few years, and be asked to retire

as a hindrance to the growth of the denomination.

There can be no possible conflict between the truth as it is in Jesus and evangelistic work conducted on right principles. And when it is declared or insinuated that principles of God's Word do hinder, it goes without the proving that the hindrance comes from the human elements which have crept in. It is necessary that these things be said in order to a correct understanding of what true evangelistic work is. It is "preaching the preaching that I bid thee." It is declaring the whole counsel of God. It is not only offering salvation through Christ's blood, but it contemplates the setting forth of duty in its length and breadth. It means to hold up Christ as Prophet, Priest and King. It is going to the people with this message wherever they can be found.

This the Covenanter Church has been doing through all its history. Preaching in moor and glen and mountain, in the streets of cities, in the squares of villages; often the meetings scattered by a merciless soldiery while the unfortunate prisoners were brutally put to death; this is the early history of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. In this land, the fathers are not yet all gone who rode through State after State, and in school-houses, in groves, in cabins, in barns,

wherever the people could meet, they preached the Gospel of the Son of God. *This was true evangelistic work.* It was blessed of the Holy Ghost. In the somewhat new form of evangelistic services of these days, the denomination is endeavoring to reap all it can through them. They are being tried everywhere the people desire to do so. They have been in many cases, where rightly conducted, productive of much good, to those within, to those without. May the Master continue to bless every proper means, and direct to ones still more efficient, until "He shall come down like rain upon the mown grass; until He shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the rivers unto the end of the earth; until they that dwell in the wilderness bow before Him, and His enemies lick the dust." But it is in place here to say that we have no sympathy with means often used "to draw" to evangelistic services. These proceed on the theory, "Get the people there by any means, then do them good." So the Sabbath is desecrated by the drum and the horn, stereopticon views, an amusing programme, etc., all intended to "draw." There is but one way to "draw" to Christ. It is not "flowers around the pulpit or in the sermon" (so says Dr. Hall); it is not attractive music, nor anything that entertains. As true as the truth of God, it is in this, "And I, if I be lifted up, will

draw." That is plain. The extent, "all men unto me." "O Zion, that bringest good tidings, get thee up into the high mountain; O Jerusalem, that bringest good tidings, lift up thy voice with strength; lift it up, be not afraid; say unto the cities of Judah, Behold your God!" (Is: xl: 9.)

CHAPTER VIII.

GROWTH OF THE DENOMINATION: HINDRANCES.

With the evangelistic spirit more intense *during the last ten years* than at any time since the division of '33, why has the per cent. of growth decreased?

Accurate statistics, earlier than 1859, are not at our command. From the division up to this date, however, there was a strong, healthy growth, probably about an hundred per cent. From 1859 to 1869 the denomination increased from 5,812 to 8,242—a net yearly growth of 243. From 1869 to 1879, the increase was from 8,242 to 10,475—a net yearly growth of 223. From 1879 to 1888—nine years—the increase was from 10,475 to 10,970—a net yearly growth of 55.

These statistics present a problem worthy of consideration. It is this: With the evangelistic spirit more *intense* during the last decade, why has there not been corresponding growth? Why is it that in the decade of intensified evangelistic zeal, the average yearly growth goes down three-fourths, from 223 to 55? As we said before, true evangelistic spirit has been in the denomination all along. But during the last decade it has developed. There is some little unrest with old and tried and successful methods. A few here and there think these too slow. They want the sowing and the reaping at the same meeting. We would not in any way wish to stifle this intensifying desire to bring men and women into the kingdom of Christ. The desire is all right. Let it grow until it becomes overpowering; until the thrice-repeated prayer of Knox, "Give me Scotland or I die," be your prayer and mine. There are but few churches in which special meetings of one form or another have not been held. Permanent missions are being established where the Gospel is preached. This is to be heartily commended. May the Lord bless all these efforts put forth to the glory of His name. There are times when God specially blesses His church, and the Covenanter Church should now be receiving special evidences of God's favor. And since He has

given the more intense desire to reach souls, and the effort is being made, it is strange that the growth has not far outstripped the decades of the past. That it should fall three-fourths is remarkable. The question is one of serious importance as its solution is difficult. Shall we go on until the principle be established without peradventure that the greater the cry, "We must be evangelistic," the less the denomination grows? Rather let the hindrances be sought out and removed "that the Word of God may have free course and be glorified."

1st. Let it be said once and for all that the difficulty is not with true evangelistic spirit. This should be cultivated more and more (as above).

2d. The difficulty is not with the distinctive principles of the church. The denomination has held these principles since its organization at the Reformation. It has held them through all its history in this land. When growth was at the highest yearly rate, these same principles were energetically, courageously and consistently held. It is not supposed that any will seek to account for the growth then by saying the principles were toned down and discipline was carelessly enforced. No. Those were days of heroes in word and deed, who believed the truth and labored to bring men to accept it. They fought mightily for God, and their efforts were crowned

with success. The church grew and multiplied. If distinctive principles be a hindrance *now*, they would have been then. The brethren who divided the church in '33 by cutting away the will of God, and substituting the will of the people in civil government, thus rejecting one of the most important principles of the denomination, and one which is supposed by many to hinder, have demonstrated and proved that full churches and large increase in membership expected have not been realized. They have grown but little in the fifty-six years, while the mother church has grown from between 3,000 and 4,000 to about 11,000. It is strange this demonstration is overlooked or cast aside. God's truth does not hinder any more than the seed hinders the harvest. It is to be admitted that now and then persons are met who say they would join were this and that not in the way. But what denomination has not exactly the same experience? At a meeting in this city a prominent Presbyterian divine said "their doctrines and bald forms were keeping their young men out." Hence the effort to change the Confession of Faith. It is the same story wherever you go. Our own experience is that in the large majority of cases the assigned reason is but an excuse, as they do not join the denomination which they claim corresponds to their belief. At all events we could get

the whole Presbyterian and Methodist Churches, were it not for our distinctive principles. But that would be no good to them and a harm to us. It would not add one to the number of God's family, nor make a single soul better. But it would take away the power of the truth which we, as a denomination, hold. If truth which sanctifies hinders, then our principles hinder. If it brings souls nearer to God, then our principles do not hinder. "In the morning sow thy seed, and in the evening withhold not thine hand: for thou knowest not whether shall prosper, either this or that, or whether they both shall be alike good." (Ec: xi: 6.) The theory that any truth hinders the work of grace, proceeds from a superficial view of conversion. The correct view is this as contained in these two passages of Scripture: "Go preach the Gospel to every creature." Not part of the Gospel, as blinded human intellect may suggest; but the whole counsel of God. This is man's part as an instrument in God's hand. He thus speaks by man's mouth. To fail, after God has made known the truth, is treason against heaven. It is withholding from men what God intended they should hear. The agent has no such right. It is not for him to sit in judgment on the message of the Most High. The second passage is God's part in conversion: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou

hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth ; so is every one that is born of the Spirit." It is the Spirit that carries conviction and produces conversion. The Spirit and the message never come in conflict. But through the Spirit, "the Word of God is quick and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword; piercing to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Given: the Spirit quickening a soul into life, the truth as held by the church can no more hinder that soul from seeking admission to the house and family of God, than well prepared soil, the gentle rain, the warm sunshine can hinder the life which is springing from the bursting seed. These but sustain the life. So truth sustains the quickened soul. The more truth, the stronger is that soul against evil. Covenanters, holding more truth, are being sanctified from participating in godless civil government ; from corruptions of Divine worship ; from the pollutions of secret oath-bound societies, etc. God is blessing the very truth, in the sanctification of the members of the church, which some would have us believe has become a stumbling-block to the work of the Spirit in converting men. No, the hindrance to the growth of the church, in these last years of special evangelistic desire and

effort, cannot be laid at the feet of Jesus by saying, "It is His truth!"

3d. We explain the low rate of growth during these years of special evangelistic interest and work *by the loss of convictions*. There is not that whole-souled belief in the distinctive principles there was a generation ago. There are doubts and doubts. Ministers, elders and laymen are not so sure. This being true, and which will not be questioned, several marked effects follow.

First: But little effort is put forth to make men see and believe these distinctive principles. It requires convictions, even in worldly things, to produce convictions in others. Times of reformation have been times of intense convictions. Look at Luther as he stood alone with God at the ecclesiastical tribunal which claimed the power of life and death. His deep convictions uttered in those memorable words, "Here I stand; I cannot do otherwise; so help me God!" were a rock as he breasted the storm of popish hatred and opposition. See the power of the truth which he, under such convictions, uttered! Look at Knox and see on his battle-flag those heroic words, "I am in the place where I am demanded of conscience to speak the truth, and therefore the truth I speak, impugn it whoso list." There was whole-souled belief in the truth which he proclaimed. See his success! Look at

the Apostles. Thoroughly convinced of the truth of their message, proclaim it they would and proclaim it they did, even unto death. What was the effect? This same spirit was caught up by their followers all along the line. They stood by the truth as a mother overboard clings to her babe. Multitudes saw and believed. The Covenant entered into in Grayfriars' churchyard, where the intensity of zeal found expression by opening veins and adding the signature with the writer's own warm blood, has moved and swayed the generations from that day to this. But where convictions are wanting, there follow opposite results. Disinterestedness is fatal to a cause, no matter how good and worthy. If we lose interest in the truth which gave us birth as a denomination, and which continues our separate denominational existence, we will speedily become extinct. We believe we say the truth when we affirm that, in this day, the distinctive principles are not graven on the conscience as they have been. This is followed by its natural result, viz.: diminished effort to make men see and believe them. "I went by the field of the slothful, and by the vineyard of the man void of understanding; and, lo, it was all grown over with thorns, and nettles had covered the face thereof, and the stone wall thereof was broken down. Then I saw and considered it well; I

looked upon it and received instruction!" (Prov. xxiv:30.)

Second: Losing faith in what was once believed, reacts on the whole system of grace. It may seem a small thing to speak against truth professed and covenanted. But it is as sad as it is destructive. Destroy a young man's faith in the Word of God as set forth in any truth, and you have pierced his soul. You have cut his anchor and set him adrift. He may drift into some other church. He may drift upon the rocks. More probably the latter. By some the distinctive principles are neglected as if they were not. By others, they are lightly spoken of. By others, they are ridiculed. This is hurtful to the growing generation. If a general should on the eve of battle thus address his soldiers, "Men, your position is bad; your powder is bad; it is a bad cause any way, and defeat is sure!" what would be the effect on the army? This well illustrates the conditions under which the Covenanter Church is laboring to-day. Practically, just such addresses are being sent all along the line. Is it any wonder that the deserters are almost as many as the recruits? No amount of zeal for evangelistic work will atone for loss of convictions. Without ball, the gun is useless, however heavy the charge of powder or loud the roar.

4th. We explain the low rate of yearly growth,

in this decade of special evangelistic interest, by the new theories which have been, and are being, instilled into the mind of the people of the denomination. They can be summed up in one sentence, viz.: distinctive principles should not be made terms of communion. Sometimes those who hold and teach such theories seem to say that distinctive principles should be made terms of communion for officers only. At other times, you would suppose they mean that it is wrong to make them terms of communion for anybody. We have not, in this connection, to do with these new theories further than to show that they hinder the growth of the church, and paralyze the special efforts put forth to bring converts into the denomination. The brethren who maintain these new theories seem to think that these righteous distinctive principles are held unrighteously by the church, and that requiring them to be accepted by candidates is unwarranted by Divine authority. The denomination is put in something of the position in which Moses and Aaron were placed when Korah and his company said, "Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy, every one of them, and the Lord is among them." They would explain the low rate of yearly increase because the acceptance of these principles is required. But forty years of splendid growth successfully contradicts the

explanation. The Gospel and truth of God may not be crucified to shield the harmful effects which their own mistaken theories are producing. It requires nothing more than a fair measure of common sense to understand that if a young man, who has some notion of connecting, should, by unfortunate providence, have his attention called to leading articles and editorials in literature which has circulation, he would probably decide for some other denomination. A young man is not so likely to grow into these, and accept them in the public profession of Christ,if they are assailed as unwarrantably exalted, and their profession unrighteously required, by those who have been standard bearers for years. There are no better young men than those reared in Covenanter families. Fostered and nourished, and more than likely converted, while in the families of the church, it rightly expects their help, and we do most earnestly protest against these things which divert them into other denominations. What a power they would be if all were retained in honest, fearless profession of the truth which was Scotland's freedom and will yet be the liberation of the world !

More still : Those who are weak in the faith in the church are strengthened in that weakness. This has two effects: one, they spread a discontented influence which reacts on the work. An-

other, their consciences are eased if they wish to leave the denomination. Their Covenant obligations are explained away. Thus they are hindered from coming in, and they are helped to go out. Not long since, I heard a brother minister, who is laboring efficiently in a congregation of about an hundred members, say that he was getting along very well until these liberal ideas were scattered through his church. Some were becoming restive under their influence. We maintain, without fear of successful contradiction, that the new theories which these kind brethren are putting forth are suicidal. They defeat the very purpose intended, unless that purpose be to have the denomination absorbed by others. We wish no better evidence that this will follow than the destructive work of these same theories fifty-six years ago. Three thousand people left the church at one time and under the influence of just such teaching. That these "new light" doctrines, if pushed, will produce the same results again is reasonable. We believe, therefore, and it is the apology for discussing this division of the subject at such length, that effort to withstand these detrimental influences is not only conserving the best interests of the denomination, but looking to the preservation of its life.

CHAPTER IX.

THE WITNESSING CHURCH AND CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES.

"By me kings reign, and princes decree justice. By me princes rule, and nobles, even all the judges of the earth." (Prov. viii: 15, 16.)

Let the Son of God be first heard on this subject so important, and which so intimately concerns the glory of His name. These are some of His declarations :

"When thou art come into the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and shalt possess it, and shalt dwell therein, and shalt say, I will set a king over me, like as all the nations that are round about me; Thou shalt in anywise set him king over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose. . . . And it shall be when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests the Levites ; and it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life; that he may learn to fear the Lord his God, to keep all

the words of this law and these statutes to do them." (Deut. xvii: 14, 18, 19.)

"And Jehu, the son of Hanani, the Seer, went out to meet him, and said to King Jehoshaphat, Shouldest thou help the ungodly, and love them that hate the Lord? therefore is wrath upon thee from before the Lord." (*2* Chron. xix: 2.)

"The God of Israel said, the rock of Israel spake to me, He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God." (2 Sam. xxiii: 3.)

"The kings of the earth do set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord, and against his anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us. He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision. . . . Thou shalt break them as with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel. Be wise now, therefore, O ye kings; be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little." (Ps. ii: 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12.)

"He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth. They that dwell in the wilderness shall bow before him, and his enemies shall lick the dust. The kings of Tarshish and the isles shall bring

presents ; the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts. Yea, all kings shall fall down before him; all nations shall serve him." (Ps. lxxii: 8, 9, 10, 11.)

"In all thy ways acknowledge him, and he shall direct thy paths." (Prov. iii: 6.)

"For the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our law-giver, the Lord is our King." (Is. xxxiii : 22.)

"And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers ; and they shall bow down to thee with their faces toward the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet." (Is. xlix : 23.)

"While the word was in the king's mouth, there fell a voice from heaven, saying, O King Nebuchadnezzar, to thee it is spoken : the kingdom is departed from thee: and they shall drive thee from men, and thy dwelling shall be with the beasts of the field : and they shall make thee to eat grass as oxen, and seven times shall pass over thee, until thou know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will." (Dan. iv: 31, 32.)

"All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." (Mat. xxviii: 18.)

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God : the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordi-

nance of God, and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. . . . For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid: for he beareth not the sword in vain : for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." (Rom. xiii: 1, 2, 3, 4.)

"He raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come, and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church." (Eph. i: 20, 21, 22.)

"The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever." (Rev. xi: 15.)

"And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS." (Rev. xix: 16.)

Thus speaketh the Son of God. These words are His words. These declarations are His declarations. They converge into a common focus, and in that focus is seen the throne of Jehovah, with its absolute and universal dominion. Upon that throne is seen the Covenant God. Civil government lies within the limits of

this universal dominion. "Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet." (Heb. ii: 8.) If this be true, and to show this is the object immediately in hand, there flow many important and serious considerations. Properly constituted, there open before the state the grandest possibilities, the most glorious opportunities in the one work for which the world stands—the redemption of the church. Improperly constituted, the state becomes worldly, sensual, devilish : an obstruction to the work of God in the salvation of men. The relations of the Christian subject to a God-rejecting and God-dishonoring state is a matter of profound importance. It is believed, however, that God has not left His people without light. In this, as in all duties, He marks out the way.

"Wisdom," in the chapter from which the words at the beginning of the discussion are taken, is supposed by all good authorities to be Christ. He speaks under that name. Therefore Christ says, "By me kings reign, and princes decree justice." Here is an assumption of authority. It covers the legislative, the executive, the judicial departments of government.

I. This positive declaration, made by the Son of God, is incompatible with the theory that Civil Government is independent of God.

There is positive assertion here on the part of

Jesus Christ. It is in language free from all ambiguity. It is open and read of all. The tremendous power which government wields corroborates the necessity of the Divine hand in civil affairs. It has at its disposal the life of its subjects; at its disposal the liberty of its subjects; at its disposal the property of its subjects. Further—and what more needful of God's watchful and restraining authority—by declaring its boundaries in blockade against the Gospel, it can keep out the light, and leave the millions under its control to go to hell. God forbid that men should speak of such power as irresponsible! that even if God command, it is not bound to obey! Some say "Government is like a banking institution or a railroad corporation." Even a superficial examination into the power which civil government wields will show plain and remarkable differences between them.

II. The open declaration on the part of the Son of God, "By me kings reign, and princes decree justice," establishes without peradventure, that CIVIL GOVERNMENT IS A DIVINE INSTITUTION.

Christ declares Himself to be the source of government and of authority. There is deep meaning in those words, "BY ME." "Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way." "The Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men." "The powers that be are ordained of God." The

tremendous authority vested in civil government proceeds from the throne of God. The institution is Divine. This clothes the magistrate, in rightly constituted government, with Divine authority. "He is the minister of God." "He beareth not the sword in vain." "A revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." The civil officer, could he but realize this fact, would see that, while the people may choose the officer, they are not the source of authority by which he acts. He is directly responsible to God. He is not there to do the will of the people, only in so far as their will agrees with the will of God. In the beginning Christ ordained two institutions—the church; the state. Both have been counterfeited. Some say, because men instinctively set up government, therefore it is not of heavenly origin. But men also instinctively set up religion. Whatever arguments can be brought against a God-ordained state can be brought against a God-ordained church. The almost irresistible demand for government is of deep significance, since it runs parallel with the divinely appointed institution.

III. Christ's declaration, "By me . . . princes decree justice," AUTHORITATIVELY RESTRAINS, on pain of His displeasure, THE LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT WITHIN THE LIMITS OF DIVINE LAW.

With this, God's command, through Moses to Israel, exactly agrees: "And it shall be when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of THIS LAW in a book out of that which is before the priests and Levites; and it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life; that he may learn to fear the Lord his God, to keep all the words of this law and these statutes to do them." The limits within which the legislator may exercise his talents are strictly defined. There is a fountain from which he must draw his inspiration, and the great fundamental principles of law. It is a narrow view that governments may be a law unto themselves. If they were, what might they not do? This is the theory of despots, and the bulwark of despotism. Its supporters are such men as the Charleses and Jameses of England; the Neros and Pharaohs; the unscrupulous rulers, whose names need but be mentioned to be despised. Enlightened nations are fast getting rid of the unrighteous theory. But the other extreme is no less unrighteous and dangerous, viz.: Law comes from the people. This is the theory in almost, if not every, republic. It is better than despotism, as life in the United States is better than life in Russia. But this is not the true position. Christ has not left the least of His subjects under independent legislative authority. He

is too deeply concerned in the interests of His blood-bought followers to leave them in the hands of scrupulous or unscrupulous men. He claims to direct nations. They may be great, millions strong; but He declares they are His subjects, and must receive law at His hand. When He sets forth His righteous law, that which infinite wisdom knows is best, and which secures the highest interests physically, intellectually, morally, spiritually, eternally—which forcibly restrains evil—He asks: "Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth do set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord, and against his anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us. He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision." These words clearly set forth the claim of the Son of God as the Lawgiver of nations. And if they cast out the Mediatorial Governor of the world from His position of legislative authority, "breaking asunder His bands and casting away His cords," He will visit in His righteous indignation until such nations are perished from the earth. Lawmakers should be deeply religious men, thoroughly consecrated to God. They must think God's thoughts after Him. Nor can there be greater disrespect, dishonor and evidence of

rebellion, than for a nation to declare that to be a lawmaker or ruler, it is not necessary to believe on His name.

IV. The object of this divinely appointed institution, Civil Government, is TO PROTECT AND ADVANCE THE CHURCH.

That the Church, the Bride, the Lamb's wife, should be accompanied by a protecting power is reasonable. She is peaceful and harmless as the dove, as she goes forth with her message of mercy. Beset on every hand by bitter enemies, there is need of protection. Hence, the "magistrate bearing not the sword in vain." Civil government has signally failed in its object where it is not a "terror to the evil." It should put away open wickedness on every hand. It is the keeper of both tables of the Law. It is as much the state's duty to put away idolatry as murder. Swearing, blasphemy, Sabbath breaking, all open violations of the moral law are to be strictly dealt with, and by the authority of the Son of God. In doing so the state protects the church from the ravages of these evils. This Divine institution was given for this very purpose. It thus prepares a highway for the church. It pulls down the mountains; exalts the valleys; makes the crooked straight; the rough places plain. To suppose that the state was instituted for itself, to live to itself, and that it has nothing to do with

the church, is a theory as fallacious as it is ruinous in its application. There is a most intimate relation between these two Divine institutions. They are commissioned by the same authority, the Son of God. They receive law from the same Person—Christ. They are engaged in the same glorious work, the salvation of the elect of God. With this agrees the words of the Apostle: "Gave him to be the head over all things to the church." God gave Christ mediatorial authority, that He might rule the nations, and constrain them to assist the church. To the same purport are the words of the prophet Isaiah: "And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and queens thy nursing mothers." These words are spoken to Zion. God is declaring what the rulers shall do for her. This illustrates the church as protected and nourished by the state. The same truth is unmistakably set forth in the history of the Old Testament church. The kings of Israel and Judah are said to "do that which was right in God's sight" when they break down the images and cut down the groves, and set up the worship of the true God. These things are sufficient to establish the principle that there is a most intimate relation between the church and the state. Sometimes ministers and members of orthodox denominations join the infidel in his cry, "No union of church and state!" This is a great

dishonor done to Jesus Christ, in whom these two institutions are united, and from whom their power comes. One of the most eminent fathers in the ministry of the Covenanter Church, who not many years ago passed on to his rest, made use of these words on a most solemn public occasion: "Ever since Christianity became a power among the nations of the world, the minds of legislators have been occupied with the difficult question, CAN church and state enter into mutual alliance, and yet each prosecute, untrammeled, its respective ends, and exercise uncontrolled its important functions? Though the verdict of the Christian people of the United States, if called to-day to answer this question, would probably be overwhelmingly in the negative, yet we conceive the pious, profound, sagacious men of the second Reformation more than two hundred years ago solved the problem correctly, answering in the affirmative. And not only so, but for a brief period in the land of the Covenants, they presented to the world what has nowhere else been witnessed, the solution in practical operation."

With this agrees in spirit the Declaration and Testimony of the Covenanter Church: "It is the duty of the Christian magistrate to take order, that open blasphemy and idolatry, licentiousness and immorality be suppressed, AND THAT THE

CHURCH OF CHRIST BE SUPPORTED THROUGHOUT THE COMMONWEALTH" . . . . (Chap. xxix : 8.)

The church has never put forth more strikingly religious and deeply spiritual documents than the NATIONAL COVENANT OF SCOTLAND, and THE SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT of the three kingdoms. Sometimes even Covenanters forget that the church and state were united in the swearing of these. They were sworn by the church, but they were sworn also by the state. They were taken and subscribed by King Charles II. at Spey, June 23, 1650. And Parliament did "ordain the same to be presented at the entry of every Parliament, and before they proceed to any other act, that the same be publicly read, and sworn by the whole members of Parliament claiming voice therein. . . . and all judges, magistrates, or other officers, of whatever place, rank, or quality . . . . to swear and subscribe the same covenant." *

These covenants strikingly set forth what is argued for in the point under discussion, viz.: THE STATE SHOULD PROTECT AND ADVANCE THE CHURCH. This is true national reformation, and should be embodied in the declaration of principles set forth by the National Reform Association now so earnestly laboring in the United States.

---

* So. of SOLEMN LEAGUE.

CHAPTER X.

APPLICATION TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.

THERE have been presented four important considerations, viz.: "Civil government is not independent"; "Civil government is a Divine institution"; "Civil government is, on pain of Christ's displeasure, restrained in legislation, within the limits of Divine law"; "Civil government is appointed and ordained to protect and advance the church." Let there be now a practical application of these fundamental truths to the government of the United States. The most remarkable, as well as the most glorious Constitution, given forth by any nation, is not the Constitution of the United States. Far from it! The three kingdoms, Scotland, England and Ireland, put forth such a Constitution two hundred and fifty years ago. That Constitution was the SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT. It is the *magna charta* of liberty! It gives government an object worthy of its exalted position. Well had it been if the founders of our government had breathed a little more

of its spirit, and drunk more deeply at the fountain of its inspiration. The Constitution of the United States is thoroughly worldly; that, thoroughly Christian. The former seeks, but fails to glorify man; the latter, to glorify God, and does it. The former does not secure the civil liberty of which it proudly boasts ; for you must deny God's hand in civil affairs before eligible to the honors and emoluments of office. An impartial examination of the Constitution of the United States reveals these facts :

I. GOD HAS BEEN REJECTED AS THE SOURCE OF THE INSTITUTION AND THE AUTHORITY BY WHICH IT ACTS.

We use the term "rejected," advisedly. It is to put the Constitution ordained by the colonists in contrast with the Constitution (the Solemn League and Covenant) ordained by the "three kingdoms" at the Reformation, out of the influence of which the stronger elements of the colonial settlers came. Through the influence of the devil, for it could not be of God, they adopted a godless Constitution. They therefore took a long and serious step backward. The Scriptural doctrine that the government and its officers should be bound to God with an oath, that they should profess, confess and maintain the true Christian religion; that they should covenant to be for God and His church, this was not only lost sight of,

in the formation of our government, but these ends were studiously avoided. This is a great dishonor to God, as it is a perversion of the objects of civil government. The fruits of this "step backward" were soon seen. In a treaty with Tripoli, dated January 3, 1797, there is this declaration, strange to the heroes of the Reformations, as it is strange to God: "The government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion; it has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion, or tranquillity of Mussulmans." This is a startling declaration to come from the highest authority in the land. It declares this heathen religion would be as much at home in the United States, and as jealously guarded as the Christian religion. As Article VI. of the Constitution declares, "This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all TREATIES made, or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the *supreme law* of the land," this treaty with Tripoli is exalted to the position of supreme law. This, taken in connection with the statement in the treaty, plainly proves the point under discussion, viz.: GOD HAS BEEN REJECTED BY THE CONSTITUTION AND LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES.

Since the Mediatorial Governor of the Uni-

verse has been cast out of the throne of this nation, it is interesting to know who occupies the place. There is a declaration which sets the matter at rest. It is found in the preamble to the Constitution. This declaration is given forth to the world and in the face of heaven, "WE, THE PEOPLE . . . DO ORDAIN, etc." There can be no misunderstanding here. God is dethroned, "we, the people," enthroned. It recalls God's forcible words to Samuel, when Israel refused to "obey the voice of Samuel, and they said, Nay, but we will have a king over us." God said to His old and faithful prophet, "They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them."

This rejection of God from the government of the United States is the greatest dishonor done to God the last centuries, in that it is sinning against the light. The Lord Jesus plainly set forth the truth of His mediatorial authority in the second Reformation, but it is already cast back at the Spirit who revealed it. The Constitution of the United States contains no recognition of God. It is as barren of it as the naked rock scorched by the Arabian sun. It knows no more of God than the heathen temple and the heathen god. Yet God is the author of civil government, and should not only be recognized outright, but His Spirit should breathe through

it as He breathes through the organized church. Indeed, it is a sin of equal magnitude for the nation not to recognize God as for the church, both institutions being Divine.

II. An examination of the Constitution discloses this: THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE IS SET UP AS THE STANDARD OF RIGHT AND AUTHORITY.

The instrument of national union goes still further than a rejection of God. He is "discharged under disgrace," as it were, from His own institution. He had declared long ago, so that men and nations might read, "He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God," and "Thou shalt provide out of all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness, and place such over them, to be rulers of thousands, and rulers of hundreds, and rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens." God has declared that such shall be the qualifications of magistrates. They are to be men, "such as fear God." But, as would be supposed, a government which dares reject God, will dare set aside His law. This the Constitution of the United States does. In Article VI. we read, "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." This public and plain rejection of God's qualification of officers, as is done in the "no religious test" clause, adds double discredit and shame to

the nation. By ruling God out of the legislative department of the government, the responsibilities of the position are assumed by "we, the people." They claim to be the law-making power. "We, the people," decide who shall be killed, who shall be saved alive, who shall be "bond," who shall be free; who may come to this country, who shall be forcibly ejected; who shall be eligible to the honors and emoluments of office, who shall not be, etc., etc. About one-eleventh of the population have assumed authority. Seven millions are making law for sixty-five millions. As these seven millions are about equally divided into two great parties, and but one of these can gain the throne, the law-making power in this government is really in the hands of between three and four millions. About one-sixteenth of the people of the United States are the lawmakers for sixty-five millions. More still; no insignificant part of this one-sixteenth is composed of the worst elements of society, men who fear neither God nor man. They are men without principle and who will use dishonorable means to accomplish their desire. Party platforms, and the moral qualifications of nominees, are the two unimpeachable witnesses, here, that these "bad elements" rule in the parties. There need be no further witness that these things are true than to refer the reader to the

legislation on temperance in the legislatures controlled by the various parties. The infamous business is licensed, and petted, and consulted, until its legislative history is not paralleled by heathen nations.

We have now the conditions of the question, viz.: The ruling party, composed of between three and four millions of men, is itself under the control of the worst elements of society, men who fear neither God nor man. Therefore, these worst elements really rule the nation. The will of the people is set up as the standard of right and authority. And this "will" narrows to the dominant party, and finally to the controlling elements in such party. "We, the people, do ordain," and it comes to this. Thus seen, it is not remarkable that they say, "We will not have this man to reign over us!" neither in His person, nor in His law. In this is explained the slavery of four millions of God's creatures, in this nation, not thirty years ago. It explains the Fugitive Slave Law, with its infamous provisions to force the citizens even of the North to hunt down and return the immortal beings escaping to liberty. It explains the doctrine of States' Rights which took such hold of the South and caused it to rebel. It explains the mail trains which go thundering and screeching through the land on the Sabbath, spreading moral desolation. It explains the presence of the awful liquor curse,

which gathers men, women and children in one united stream and pours them, hissing and cursing, into the gulf of perdition. It explains the hold Romanism is getting in the government. It explains the character of the men who get into office, from the lowest to the highest. The will of the people is the paradise of the political demagogue. The more corrupt the "will," the deeper he burrows and the more filth he brings up. Saul rejected the will of God, and substituted his own will and the will of the people, in the matter of the Amalekites. It cost him his kingdom. "Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee from being king." To say, "we, the people," rule, and our will shall be supreme law, causes us, as a nation, to parallel these wicked acts of Saul. We saved slavery until God tore away the shackles in bloody and terrible judgments. We are now saving alive the liquor traffic, the Sabbath mail, etc. It is a fearful declaration, "we, the people," rule! It is the proclamation of rebellion in the dominions of the Almighty. Listen to what God says in reference to it! "Why do the heathen [nations] rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord and against his anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their

cords from us. He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision. . . Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; Thou shalt dash them in pieces as a potter's vessel." Success? No! Witness the people, beloved of the Lord, on their weary march to Babylon! Witness the people, not beloved of the Lord, the ten tribes, scattered and lost as a nation!

It is admitted by all Christian people that Christianity is a blessing to any nation. But the great multitude of Christians are yet unwilling to say, "The nation should publicly own the law of Christ," as at once the greatest blessing to the nation and the greatest glory to the Redeemer's name. What greater honor to Christ than for this great nation, sixty-five millions strong, to declare before the world that her greatness is due to the law of God! What higher duty than for the nation to swear allegiance to that law forever! This is a question to which no satisfactory answer can be given. Christ is the most blessed King, and wherever He reigns, blessings abound. Why reject Him? Why reject His law? "What evil hath He done?" Though statesmen be against Him, and shut their eyes to the fact that His religion makes grand nations, yet the time shall come when "The kings of Tarshish and the isles shall bring presents; the kings of Sheba and

Seba shall offer gifts. Yea, all kings shall fall down before him, all nations shall serve him."

III. A most critical examination of the Constitution fails to disclose an implied or expressed acknowledgment of the STATE'S DUTY TO PROTECT AND ADVANCE THE CHURCH.

Some may not agree that this is the state's duty. But when they stand before the throne, in that vast multitude of the redeemed, and more fully realize the love of the Son of God for His church, they will then agree that "He was made head over all things to the church," that He might command them to assist in this most glorious work. It at once gives civil government a glorious object, viz.: To protect "the Bride, the Lamb's wife." But the Constitution of government, in this land, does not recognize this as duty, and immediately drops to the plane of selfish ends. It goes a step further: It puts the Christian religion on a level with heathenism and infidelity. (See treaty with Tripoli.) Further: In the administration of the Constitution, the government hinders the church by protecting some of the most gigantic evils known to modern civilization. These evils, protected, not only become stumbling-blocks, but they are mighty forces opposing the church's progress. The liquor traffic throws itself across the path of the church. The two hundred thousand saloons are the

bulwarks behind which this enemy is entrenched. In the smoke of battle, and the thunder of this infernal artillery, there fall each year sixty thousand dead. But this system of iniquity is licensed and stands by the authority of the government. The government, therefore, openly opposes the church. Further, the Constitution of the United States delegates authority to the government to continue business on the Lord's day. This is done in the Sabbath mail. The number of men in the post-office department, and on the railroads in transportation, is probably about one hundred thousand. This is the size of the army with which the government opposes the church. They call out one hundred thousand every Sabbath, with the command, "Break the Sabbath!" It matters not if this is done on the plea of "business demands." The devil will always have a reason ready. The government has led the way in Sabbath traffic on the railroads. The Constitution, therefore, authorizes the government to not only oppose the church, but causes the government to lead the way in breaking down morality. Congress sat during the Sabbath on March 3, 1889. By what authority? By the authority of the Constitution! Who gave the Constitution such authority? "We, the people," who ordained it. Therefore Congress sat by the authority of every man who gives his allegiance to the Consti-

tution. But continuing business on the Lord's day puts Congress, and therefore the government, in opposition to the church. Congress further declares that they will use every Sabbath for business if they wish to. What a long step backward this is from the position taken by the government of the three kingdoms, at the swearing of the SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT!

The three illustrations given, as to the opposition of the Constitution to the church, and the forces which it sets at work to withstand the church's progress, are as sufficient to prove the point, and do prove it as conclusively as if five hundred were presented. The Constitution does not protect and advance the church! It opposes the church. It fights against her. By all the force of its tremendous example, it leads the way in wickedness. It does so by all the forces of statute law. It intrenches itself by requiring an oath to this wickedness before eligible to the honors and emoluments of office. It has passed beyond the boundaries of right authority, and goes out of its way to dishonor the Most High. The state has no right to inquire of a man's opinions, but it is the keeper of both tables of the Law in their application to the outward conduct of the subject. In doing this it protects the church, and prepares the "highway" for Zion. The church is the institution which the state

ought to rejoice in honoring. "And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising." These words are concerning the blessings of the Gospel and the enlargement of the church. They continue, "Therefore thy gates shall be open continually; they shall not be shut day nor night, that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought. For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted." (Isaiah lx: 3, 11, 12.)

CHAPTER XI.

DISSENT.

The Constitution has now been considered in the light of the three Scriptural principles, set forth in the preceding part of this discussion. It is found that the Constitution rejects God; that it rejects His law; that it rejects the church. It rejects these in a manner to end deliberation, controversy, doubt or contest. What, then, is duty?

The Covenanter Church acts decisively. It holds it to be wrong to swear allegiance to such

Constitution, and requires its members to enter their dissent from it and protest against it. This requires, on the part of members, staunchness of character, firmness of principle, well-grounded faith.

Before grouping the reasons for "dissent and protest," it can be said that dissent and protest is a principle acted upon by men in their political relations. The National Platform, put forth by the Democratic party in the summer of '88, caused many to dissent; some, because of what it did contain; some, because of what it did not contain. Perhaps they fully agreed with the platform with the exception of one plank. But they deemed this a sufficient reason to leave the party, work against it and join the Republican. The individual, in this case, dissents from the action of three and one-half millions of people. Further, a man who has been a member of the Republican party for many years is possibly dissatisfied with the position taken on the temperance question. He dissents, and steps over into the Prohibition party. He says the action of the three and one-half millions of people is wrong in the sight of God, and refuses to be identified with it. The principle is one and the same when the Covenanter dissents from the platform of the whole political body called the Constitution. If it be honorable in the Democrat to dis-

sent from the platform of the Democratic party, believing that one or more of its principles are wrong; if it be honorable in the Republican to dissent from the Republican party, because he cannot subscribe to its principles; it is equally honorable in the Covenanter to dissent from the Constitution of the United States, when it rejects God, His law and His church. And especially is this true since the platform of the nation—the Constitution—must be accepted with an oath.

The following are some of the reasons why the Covenanter will not swear allegiance to the Constitution of the United States:

I. HAVING SWORN WITH UPLIFTED HANDS THAT CHRIST IS THE KING OF THIS NATION, WE CANNOT SWEAR ALLEGIANCE TO A CONSTITUTION WHICH REJECTS HIM.

The Covenanter denomination claims to stand by the Lord, practically, as well as theoretically. The United Presbyterian denomination holds the doctrine of "Christ, the King of nations," theoretically. The National Reform Association holds and teaches the same doctrine theoretically. This is not sufficient. There must be the practical application of the principle to conduct. But little progress is made until this is done. One duty of the church is to apply the great doctrines of salvation. The doctrine of Christ's

kingly authority should be applied. "Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven: but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say? Whosoever cometh to me and heareth my sayings, AND DOETH THEM, I will show you to whom he is like." If David is the king, it is wrong to swear allegiance to Absalom. If Christ be the King of this nation it is wrong to swear that "we, the people," are. If Christ be the King of this nation, and is rejected and dethroned by "we, the people," it is wrong, since we own Him as our Lord and our God, to swear a confederacy with those who have cast Him out. "Say ye not a confederacy, to all those to whom this people shall say, a confederacy: neither fear ye their fear, nor be afraid." He who believes that Christ is King of this nation, and yet swears allegiance to the Constitution which rejects Him, nullifies his testimony. Further, he is teaching that the doctrine should not be applied to the conduct. He teaches that a rebellion against Christ should be supported, and by an oath. This is wrong. He who teaches "Christ, the King of nations," has failed in the discharge of the commission unless he teaches how the individual may be free from the sin which our nation is committing against "the Lord's Anointed."

II. HAVING SWORN WITH UPLIFTED HANDS THAT CHRIST IS THE LAWGIVER OF THIS NATION, WE CANNOT SWEAR ALLEGIANCE TO A CONSTITUTION WHICH REJECTS GOD'S LAW.

A meeting of national importance, to consider marriage and divorce, was held in Philadelphia on Oct. 27th, 1889. The Hon. Judge Russell M. Thayer presided. He said that he had made entries and issued decrees of divorce from the bench against the dictates of his conscience because he was compelled by his oath to administer a *preposterous*, *immoral* and un-Christian law. "In many and many a case," he said, "have I felt that this thing was being done by agreement, and that the people who were bound by the law of God to remain united, were sundering themselves by a trick, and I did not have the power or capacity to stop it. I have made many such decrees against the dictates of my own conscience, because I was obliged by my official oath to do it, because I had sworn to administer the law."

These words of Judge Thayer state one thing, and suggest another. They set forth the unrighteous divorce laws of Pennsylvania. They *suggest* that Judge Thayer should not have taken oath—that he did wrong before God to take an oath, to administer these un-Christian laws. He confesses to un-Christian acts here, and because he has sworn to be obedient to the will of "we,

the people." But to *swear* that you will steal does not absolve you from guilt ; nor does the Judge's oath, that he will separate families according to the wicked laws of Pennsylvania. This forcefully, clearly and Scripturally, and by high judicial authority, illustrates that the Covenanter's position is right, which is this : It is wrong to exalt the will of the people to the position of supreme law, and require an oath that this will, whether it agrees or disagrees with the will of God, shall be carried out.

If, " we, the people," will not bind themselves to be governed by the law of God, they should not expect Christians to join them in the administration of the Government. If " we, the people," will not say we mean to do right, as set forth in the law of God, the Christian should not say, "a confederacy " with them. Thirty years ago this nation was holding in bondage four millions of God's creatures. Why ? Because the " will of the people," as set forth in the Constitution, held them in slavery. And yet, during all those long years, during which the cry of the oppressed was going up to God, while children were being torn from parents, and parents from children; while God commanded to "let the oppressed go free," the vast multitude of Christians in the nation were swearing allegiance to the Constitution which held them in bondage.

When the liquor traffic, with all its physical, moral and spiritual desolation, fairly bespatters the nation with the blood of crushed and mangled victims ; when the wails and groans of the dying are heard even above the wild roar of this vortex of death ; when it is morally certain that the next generation will be forced to yield up its two million three hundred thousand to be sent to hell; when God condemns the traffic an outlaw, and commands governments to destroy it ; yet the multitudes of good Christian people in the nation lift up their hands before God and swear that the will of the people shall be supreme. And when the Constitution licenses the awful traffic, sending it forth by authority to do its worst, these good people yet cling to their idol—the Constitution—and adhere to the principle that "we, the people," have right "to establish iniquity by law."

When the treaty was made with Tripoli, and which is supreme law, and to which allegiance must be sworn in swearing to the Constitution, declares that "there is no God in this nation," is it not remarkable that good Christian people are willing to swear to such a God-dishonoring Constitution ! "Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon, lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice, lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph."

Blessed be God for the Covenanter Church, which witnesses against these dishonors to God, these wrongs to man! That "we, the people," rule, is a principle pernicious in its operations, ineffectual for the restraint of evil. There is needed a law which goes forth with an authority stronger than man's; it must go with the authority of God. This the Covenanter Church testifies for, and refuses the honors and emoluments of office under the United States until such recognition of Divine authority shall be made.

III. Covenanters do not swear allegiance to the Constitution because IT OPENLY AND IN THE FACE OF THE COMMANDMENT, OPPOSES THE CHURCH AND DISPUTES, BY CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTE LAW, HER TEACHINGS.

Civil government has not changed. It is the same to-day as it was three thousand years ago. God blessed the kings of Israel and Judah when they, as His magistrates, overthrew idolatry, and put down Sabbath breaking. The zeal which these kings displayed in the promotion of the church's interests received hearty Divine approbation. Refusing to sanction the religion of the true God, they were judged by the Most High. When they opposed the church, the most dreadful calamities overtook them and their kingdoms. The government of the United States claim that the Constitution binds them to neutrality in

religious matters. If it does, so much the worse for the Constitution. So much stronger the evidence that it is not what it should be. An institution which has its source in Christ *cannot be neutral*, and *stand a disinterested spectator, toward the church for which Christ gave His blood.* This is reasonable as it is Scriptural. But the Constitution of the United States is NOT neutral! It is the source of laws which contradict the church as they do the law of God. This is unseemly in a government which claims to represent a Divine institution. It is putting the two Divine institutions, the church and the state, at war with each other. The Constitution of the United States opposes, and with all its tremendous influence and power, the church in the Fourth Commandment —Sabbath mail. It opposes the church in the Sixth Commandment—liquor traffic. It opposes the church in the Seventh—easy divorce. It opposes in the Third—unscriptural oath. It opposes in the First—"we, the people," the source of authority. It opposes in the Second—open idolatry is protected. State papers oppose the church—they reject Christ from Thanksgiving proclamations. "He that hath not the Son hath not the Father." These things react with terrible force on the church and her work. Further: the example of magistrates, and their public acts as officers in the nation, are, with

honorable exceptions, in keeping with the Constitution.

What shall the Christian do? Shall he assist in these things? Can he pray consistently if he does? The Covenanter Church protests against these things as wrong. And as the power to thus hinder the church comes from the Constitution, they protest against the Constitution as unrighteous. Christ cannot be divided against Himself, nor can His institutions oppose each other. If THEY DO OPPOSE EACH OTHER, THE CHRISTIAN SHOULD STEP ASIDE AND OUT OF THE ONE WHICH COMMITS THE OFFENSE. This the Covenanter does in view of the offenses against God and His church by the Constitution of the United States.

IV. Covenanters will not swear allegiance to the Constitution, because in so doing THEY WOULD BECOME "*particeps criminis*" IN ALL THE EVILS WHICH IT PERMITS, PROTECTS AND SANCTIONS, IN ITSELF, OR BY STATUTE LAW.

There is vagueness and indefiniteness, in the mind of men, as to where responsibility for national wrongs rests. Some say, upon the government at Washington. But you go to Washington, and see only a few men, who are sent by others, and with their duties definitely described.

There are two responsible: First, those who send up the officers by vote. Second, those who give them Constitution and laws for their guid-

ance. Those who vote, and with the understanding that the Constitution, and laws made in pursuance thereof, shall define the duties of the officer, become the responsible parties. If we accept the Constitution, and vote for officers to administer it, we must be responsible for the evils permitted, protected and sanctioned. Hence, all who give their allegiance to the Constitution of the United States are responsible for the wrongs to God and man which are perpetrated in this nation. More still; this responsibility is not divided according to a rate per cent. That would reduce it to absurdity. If ten men murder one man, they are all murderers, and each suffers the penalty as if he alone were the guilty party. If sixty-five millions of people agree together to cast out of the throne of this nation the Mediatorial Governor of the world, and usurp the powers and prerogatives of the government themselves, they become INDIVIDUALLY RESPONSIBLE for DETHRONING THE SON OF GOD, AND FOR ALL THE WICKEDNESS WHICH THE GOVERNMENT THEY SET UP PERMITS, PROTECTS, AND SANCTIONS. Thus viewed, it becomes a serious matter to join even with a vast multitude of people in adopting a Constitution which is not up to the standard of Divine law. That there are serious evils, most damaging to the cause of truth and righteousness, most dishonoring to God, most

hurtful to men, sanctioned and protected by the Constitution, has been, in the preceding discussion, clearly proved. That these rest on the individual who accepts the Constitution, in all their force, as if he were the only citizen, cannot, it is believed, be successfully refuted. Therefore every man who swears allegiance to the Constitution becomes individually responsible for the preservation, in this nation, of some of the most gigantic evils known to modern civilization.

The Covenanter refuses to carry such responsibility. He frees himself by "dissent and protest"; by refusing to swear allegiance to such Constitution; by refusing to vote or hold office under it; by showing to the nation the duty and necessity of repentance and reformation.

V. The Covenanter will not swear allegiance to the Constitution, because HE HAS NO POLITICAL RIGHTS IN AN INFIDEL GOVERNMENT.

We have right to live in this land, for it is God's country. We have right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, for these are God-given rights. But if the government of this land knows no God, then God does not know the government. It would be unbecoming in His people to accept the honors and emoluments of office in a government which God does not know, and which is at war with Divine law. Further; having given themselves wholly to Christ, they are

not at liberty to join a rebellion against Him. No; they must conduct themselves so as to be free from responsibility. The Christian has political rights in a properly constituted government. But he has none in an infidel government. Some Christians feel that it is a great cross to forego political privileges in this government. A thorough investigation will show that they have no political privileges to forego.

CHAPTER XII.

OBJECTIONS TO "PROTEST AND DISSENT."

1ST. IT is objected that if all Christians should do as Covenanters, the government would be left in the hands of the worst elements.

This is begging the question. The government is in the hands of these already. The very worst sot, who makes the air fairly blue with blasphemy, is held up and led to the polls. The debauched and profane go to the polls. The infidel goes to the polls. The anarchist goes to the polls. The Sabbath-breaker goes to the polls. All these are in office. Laws against drunken-

ness, immorality, blasphemy, Sabbath-breaking, etc., are not executed. Boast if you will of this government, but what do they do for God and humanity more than others? Look at Catholicism. It is permitted to oppose, hinder and destroy our common school system.

W. E. Curtis, Secretary of Commission of the United States, to visit the Governments of Central and South America, says: "The Argentine Confederation is the leading Republic in South America. It has THE MOST EXPENSIVE FREE SCHOOL SYSTEM IN THE WORLD, except in Australia. The Jesuits are excluded from all influence in educational matters. A Papal Nuncio and an Archbishop were banished for attempting to interfere with the schools. Many of the teachers are lady graduates from our own colleges, and Protestants."

"In Uruguay free schools and compulsory education are established, and all Catholic schools have been abolished, and monks and nuns are expelled from the country and all monasteries and secret religious orders prohibited."

"Venezuela has declared itself independent of the Pope, suppressed monastic orders and confiscated their property."

"Brazil is in the same course, and has given religious orders ten years to dispose of their property."

"In Mexico, Romish parochial schools are abolished, the confessional is public, free schools with compulsory attendance are established."

Contrast these things with the way popery is petted and fattened in this nation, with its separate schools, its monasteries, its nunneries, its Jesuitical orders! Why boast of a land of freedom, when it is a land of slavery? The rum power and Catholicism and godlessness have sunk this land in point of morality, and the sooner we become conscious of it the better! If all Christians, who have given their allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ, would declare their "protest and dissent," and act consistent thereto, it would awaken the nation like a thunder peal! Covenanters are the most patriotic lovers of their country! If a vessel is drifting down to the precipice of Niagara, the strongest argument you can use is to *go ashore.* This Covenanters do as God declares over this nation, "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God."

"But you are doing nothing!" So they say. But we are doing this—we are preserving our integrity with God. This is the Christian's first and highest duty. Again, we are uttering a warning to this nation. This is more than others can say. Further, the Covenanter denomination is teaching the principles of civil government,

showing the nation her duty to Christ, pointing out the line of national reformation, as is no other denomination.

2d. It is objected that Joseph and Daniel held office, the former under Pharaoh, the latter under Nebuchadnezzar.

Granted. They held office. But notice the conditions under which they accepted office. Here is the Constitution which Pharaoh handed to Joseph: "Thou shalt be over my house, and according to thy word shall all my people be ruled." The government is fully and completely committed to the hands of Joseph. More: it is done with the expressed understanding that he should govern in the fear of that God who had given him such wisdom. This Joseph exactly did.

Daniel held office. So did Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. But here is the Constitution delivered to these servants of God as they were inducted into office: "Therefore, I, Nebuchadnezzar, make a decree, That every people, nation and language, which speak anything amiss against the God of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego, shall be cut in pieces, and their houses shall be made a dunghill." They are here directed to administer the government according to the laws of the true God. Further, the same Scripture declares that these servants of God refused to break God's law. They would not bow to an

image, though they were cast into the burning, fiery furnace. This testifies that they were Covenanters. When the Constitution rejected the true God, they rejected the Constitution. This is what Covenanters, their spiritual descendants, do to-day when the Constitution of the United States rejects God, and requires you to swear that you will protect idolatry, the liquor traffic, Sabbath desecration, popery, etc., etc., they say, "We cannot, we will not."

3d. It is objected that Covenanters will wait long before this reformation is accomplished.

The time may be long, it may be short, God knows. But this we know, the Word of the Lord is sure. The nation will own Christ as its Executive, Lawgiver, and Judge. The time how long is in the hand of God. But the "kingdoms of this world SHALL become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ." The "time when," should not, and does not enter into the question, but, Is it duty? Is it right?

At a great battle in which William, Prince of Orange, was successful, the enemy was permitted to march out of the fortress, the Prince, for reasons satisfactory to himself, expecting at the proper time, to take the commander of the enemy's forces prisoner. As this commanding officer was marching away, a brigadier was sent to bring his person. The commanding officer

was immediately surrounded by his staff, who vowed they would die in his defense. Just then, a body of the Prince's cavalry came up, and the brigadier answered, "My business is to obey orders, not troubling myself about consequences." Thus it is with the people of God and this rebellious government. "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing,and I will receive you." (2 Cor. vi:17.) "And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her,my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." (Rev. xviii : 4.)

CHAPTER XIII.

SHOULD THE WITNESSING CHURCH GIVE UP DISSENT?

The latitudinarian views, the liberal tendencies, spoken of in the opening chapter, are not without their influence on the Covenanter Church. When almost every denomination is seriously discussing the question, Should it not take lower ground, and be more conformed to the world? it is not strange that the Reformed Presbyterian

Church should feel the tendencies of the times. These are felt, and are producing more or less disharmony.

When a denomination is about to take a lower position the conflict generally rages, in the providence of God, around some particular doctrine, which stands or falls as the spiritual thermometer of the organization. As the heat of battle increases each party becomes more and more outspoken, until the whole denomination is swept from its moorings, as a vessel whose anchor chain has parted; or, the conservatives holding the position, the liberals drift away to their own level.

The point about which the conflict gathers, in the Covenanter Church, is "dissent and protest." If this be maintained, the denomination continues to witness for the high attainments of the Reformations. It is to be hoped that the present indications of surrendering this "citadel" will pass away. But these indications are not to be lightly passed by. If, as the great Boston lecturer says, there is peace only "in resisting the beginnings of evil," the present is the time when the friends of truth should be active in guarding against the encroachments of error, and resist with determination the giving up of one fortress after another, which, at last, leaves the "citadel," "dissent," exposed, with probabil-

ities of surrender. No amount of reproach, or public condemnation, should deter them from faithfully laying open fallacious theories, their tendencies, and final ruin to the church. Let the "marching orders" of those who wish to be true to the attainments of the past, the obligations of the present, and the heritage to the generations to come, be such as these:

"First PURE; then peaceable." "Stand in the way, and see and ask for the old paths, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest to your souls."

"Hold fast that which thou hast, that no man take thy crown." "Earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints." "Hold fast the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me." "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life."

What stupendous results hinge on fidelity! The writer needs no apology, therefore, for attempting to show that there are forces at work in the Covenanter Church whose unavowed purpose is to cause the denomination to give up "dissent and protest."

First, and chief of subversive forces, is a FALSE POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY.

The writer shall not attempt to set it forth. He could not. It is confessedly new. It is not more than twenty-five years old. It is the same age as the National Reform Association. It grew

up with it. It has been transferred to literature of the Covenanter Church. It is influencing decisions. It is overthrowing previously accepted theories. It is carrying the day everywhere. It admits Covenanters to the polls to vote for measures of all kinds, saying, "You are not guilty of the violation of obligations." It has been pushed so far that some who had accepted such philosophy find it necessary, on maturer reflection, to reject it. If they had only rejected it before the harm had been done! The pastor of Sterling, Kan., a father in the church and full of good works, says, in a forceful article against this political philosophy in Nov., '89, OUR BANNER: "But to explain it [our dissent] by referring to political bodies only seems to me to involve the matter in deeper mystery; indeed, *I never heard of a political body in connection with our dissent till about 20 years ago. Now, within a year or two, it has been discovered that* THERE ARE TWO—one to make the Constitution, the other to administer it." (Italics ours.)

The far-sighted and keenly discriminating pastor of Second Boston,* in an article in Nov., '89, OUR BANNER, says, "The Covenant ['71] knows nothing of two political bodies, especially in one

* Since these pages were written the beloved brother has passed on to his rest.

and the same nation ; it never heard of such a thing, never dreamed of it. Of this second political body it might be said in the words of Moses, ' It is a new god, come newly up, whom your fathers feared not.' " After having shown the fallacy of such political philosophy, he continues, " We trust our readers will have patience with the metaphysical character of this paper; it is not our fault. We have only been endeavoring to follow in the path in which Synod now walks. Moreover, it is not an iota more metaphysical than our church position now is; but yet we candidly acknowledge it is so metaphysical that it is absurd to maintain it longer as a distinct position."

It is not supposed that those who put forth this philosophy were not sincere. But the heathen mother is sincere when she casts her babe into the arms of a burning god. Sincerity does not change results.

Second. Synod has taken a long step toward giving up "dissent," *by authorizing members to go to the polls and vote for amendments.*

The same brother whose words are given above continues thus: " We made bold to say in Synod that when we were compelled to let the right foot go to the polls, we would not prevent the left from following it. And we say so again, meaning exactly what we say." He *was* com-

pelled by Synod to let his "right foot"—his members—go to the polls, and vote for amendments. Does he mean that they can now go and vote for men? It would appear so. He continues: "We have reached that point in the prosecution of our work, when our ends are so nearly attained that the most honest and able men among us cannot say what is, and what is not, consistent with our position. And at this point we submit *it becomes necessary to leave the matter to every man's own judgment and conscience.*" (Italics ours.) "This result not only follows among ourselves from Synod's last action, but that action sweeps away the last recognizable difference between us and our brethren of the General Synod."

It is not said that this brother is an authority on this subject, or that he correctly represents and explains the action of last Synod, but it must be admitted that he has good judgment and his opinions are entitled to careful consideration. He feels that Synod's action on voting for amendments is a surrender of the whole position. Others think likewise. Probably all who voted for the negative, with exceptions that could be counted on the fingers of one hand, think so. It is a matter of serious importance when forty, of one hundred and sixty, think the position has been virtually given up. It is believed, however, that

the cobwebs of this new political philosophy, by whose flank movement the victory was gained, will sooner or later be brushed away, and that the denomination will be free from the confusion which it produces.

Third. The literature of the denomination manifests unrest with the unpopular doctrine of "dissent."

This there is not room here to review. Literature, more or less under disguise, but none the less truly, reveals decided unrest with the unpopular doctrine of "dissent." A new "church philosophy," corresponding to the new "political philosophy," is gaining currency in the denomination. It philosophizes about the admission and qualifications of candidates, and reaches conclusions quite as subversive of good order and the intelligent acceptance of the distinctive principles of the church, as its sister "ism," political philosophy.

It is now in place to show that these tendencies exactly correspond to those in the Covenanter Church before the division of '33. One or two documents will establish the proposition without peradventure.

The following is a Memorial addressed to the Synod of 1833. It shows how they had grown weary with the doctrine of "dissent," and memorialized Synod to lift the burden :

"DOCUMENT NO. 8.

"MEMORIAL FROM TENNESSEE.

"Reverend Moderator and Remnant Members of the Reformed Presbyterian Synod to meet in Philadelphia in August, 1833:

"DEAR BRETHREN: *Whereas*, You have before you for a considerable time the subject of our relations to civil government, and the political institutions thereof in the United States:

"Your memorialists, sensible of the extensive bearing of your decisions on that subject as it regards the interests of the church, we cannot refrain from expressing a deep solicitude in the same. We would not be understood as dictating to your Christian body. We beg leave, however, to suggest, as the subject regards the application of principle, and not the principle itself, the impropriety of making terms of communion of these points, on which the learned, the aged, the experienced, differ When the strong are divided, what may we expect of the weak? Let not then, we entreat you, allegiance or non-allegiance to the United States be made terms of communion in our church. . . . It is painful in the extreme to hear young applicants required, as a term of membership, to denounce the government of our country as immoral; though they are come to

years of discretion, may be, and often are very limited both in reading and experience."

It is seen in this that the plea of "*inability to comprehend*" was urged then. It was urged also that it was only "*the application of principle.*"

It was urged also that it was painful to require candidates to say of this government, "It is immoral."

As the Synod of '33 divided, the General Synod was under the necessity of declaring itself as to the relations of that new branch of the church to the institutions of our land. Such declaration was made in a series of resolutions, of which the following is the third:

"*Resolved*, That this church, as such, has never had leisure to examine the institutions of the land so fully and to obtain such evidence upon the subject as to justify a definite judgment of their character; and hence, much in this, as in most other relations and pursuits of life, has by the Supreme Judiciatory been left to an ENLIGHTENED AND CONSCIENCE DISCRETION, guided by the Word of God, and the well-known principles and standards of our church; *with the understanding and confident expectation that our courts and members would be free from all vexatious prosecutions in matters upon which the Supreme Judiciatory has not passed.*"

It will be noticed here that the General Synod

withdraws its judgment against this government, of immorality. It says, "It does not know."

It says "dissent" shall be left "to conscientious and enlightened discretion." It will no longer hold the doctrine as a church. It dismisses all complaints against those who had voted and held office, as "vexatious prosecutions," which shall no longer be countenanced.

It is only necessary to lay these things alongside of the undermining forces mentioned above as at work at the present time, to see that history is repeating itself. The church is traveling over the same ground. The old arguments, weather-beaten, brown and bare, by standing without these long years, are again brought in, brushed up anew, and sent forth as the results of profound thought. It would appear that the battle is to be fought over again. Therefore every soldier, tried and true, should be found at his post. God expects every man to do his duty. It may be years before the problem is again solved; it may be a short time. This we know, the truth is sure to triumph. If God means to reduce the band of the Covenanters, as was Gideon's army, we know that the three hundred will achieve the victory. If Gideon had changed God's commands, His terms of communion, his army would have been larger, but not victorious. But the three hundred, crying, "The sword of the Lord and of

Gideon," discomfited the enemy, when all Israel joined in the spoiling and slaughter of their foes. The Covenanter Church has nothing to fear even from reduced numbers. "God in the midst of her doth dwell."

"God is our refuge and our strength,
In straits a present aid;
Therefore, although the earth remove
We will not be afraid.

"Walk about Zion, and go round
The high towers thereof tell;
Consider ye her palaces,
And mark her bulwarks well."

Let the old "*Resolution*," the battle-cry of the sadly bereaved and shattered church at the division of '33, be again run up the standard, linked with Christ and the glory of His immortal name:

"*Resolved*, That as it has always been in the proceedings and history of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, both in the land of our forefathers and in this land, a great and leading object to bear an explicit and practical testimony to the truth respecting civil government as the ordinance of God, and the subjection of the nations to the Messiah, so it is utterly inconsistent with our doctrinal standards and judicial acts for any member of this church to sit on juries, to hold

office, or swear allegiance to the Constitution of the United States."

SHOULD THE WITNESSING CHURCH GIVE UP DISSENT? No: and for these, among other considerations:

I. THE REASONS FOR DISSENT ARE THE SAME NOW AS BEFORE.

There is need for clear thinking here. The optimist says, "Victory is nigh, even at the doors." He seems to see the immediate triumph of the principles of the Covenanter Church. He is so well satisfied that "the day is gained," that he is almost, if not altogether, willing to let "dissent" go as having served its purpose. Others seem to feel that the principles have taken such hold of the masses that "dissent" should no longer be required as a condition of membership, but that it should be left to "a conscientious and enlightened discretion." Others have come to disbelieve in "dissent." They want to get down into the muddy pool of politics. Others, again, born in the land, and who do not have to take oath as they would deposit a ballot, cannot see why they should not. Others, again, are susceptible to the influences of the political demagogue and the political harangue. Others are carried away by the Prohibition party, and think they must vote for officers to sustain the prohibitory laws. These influences, operating

against the position of the Covenanter Church, were not so manifest twenty-five years ago as now. But after all that can be said on any or on all these lines has been set forth, the indisputable fact remains—THE REASONS FOR DISSENT ARE NOT REMOVED. They remain intact. They are as strong as ever, and affirm with all their original force that the Covenanter Church, in its position of "dissent," *is right.*

The Constitution is "dissented" from because *it rejects God;* because *it rejects God's law;* because *it sanctions and protects overt acts of wickedness.* Have any of these causes been removed? Not one! Has national reform been pushed so far that God and His law are about to be acknowledged in the Constitution of the United States? No! and it is idle nonsense to think so. If there be sixty-five millions of people in the United States to-day, it can be truly said that three-fourths of those millions have never heard of national reform, and three-fourths of those who have heard, have no definite conception of its principles. The situation may as well be looked squarely in the face. It adds nothing to be visionary, and to hurrah before your armor is fairly girded. The Covenanter Church cannot afford to feel that its principles have about triumphed, and throw off the hawser which has held it so close to God, and free from this nation's

guilt. The slave has been permitted to go free, *but the authority which bound the slave has not been surrendered.* The nation still stands in the very presence of those judgments of blood and slaughter, by which God crushed slavery, and declares, "We, the people," rule, and say who shall be bond, who shall be free.

II. The Covenanter Church should not, cannot give up "dissent," because it has declared before God and the world that it is wrong to "RECEDE FROM A MORE CLEAR AND PARTICULAR TESTIMONY TO A MORE GENERAL AND EVASIVE ONE."

Many condemnations have been pronounced upon the "new light" body, during the last fifty-six years, for this very thing. An examination of the literature of the score of years after the division shows how their "receding from a more clear and particular testimony to a more general and evasive one," was regarded. It was said, in unqualified terms, that they did WRONG. Shall those who pronounced the rebuke now be guilty of the same sin, and thus in an aggravated sense?

But it is affirmed that God's people are kept out, and His little ones are offended by these doctrines which they neither know nor understand. The implication is that they can understand God's decrees, His works of providence,

the Trinity, the Humanity and Divinity of Christ, Justification, Adoption, Sanctification, the Resurrection, etc. But when it comes to understanding that "God rules the nations," that "He is Governor of the nations," that "He is Lawgiver, Executive and Judge," and that you should witness against a government which does not so acknowledge, this, it is said, is far beyond the reach of children in Christ, and it is affirmed with tears that "God's little ones are offended." A comparative study of these doctrines will show that the latter are quite as easily understood, yea more easily, than the former. This plea of inability to comprehend is begging the question. It is a subterfuge which is easily punctured. Those who use it need to have their love to "Christ, the King of nations," revived. They have become bewildered, and suppose they love humanity more than others.

Satan stoutly opposes the duty of "dissent," in that it makes so plain before the world that Christ is the nation's King. He bitterly resents the intrusion of the Son of God in these dominions. He does not care how much you SAY that Christ is the King of this nation, but when you come to *act it out* his wrath is fierce. Now if he can only prevail upon the Covenanter Church to haul down that flag, he says that he will remove the reproach hitherto resting on the

denomination; that many will join who are kept out, etc.

> "More smooth than butter are his words,
> While in his heart is war;
> His speeches are more soft than oil,
> And yet drawn swords they are."

The church wisely condemns the following error, "That it is lawful, in order to enlarge the church, to open a wider door of communion, by declining from a more pointed testimony to one which is more loose and general." (Tes. Chap. xxxiii.)

III. The Covenanter Church has covenanted with God that it "WILL CONTINUE TO REFUSE TO INCORPORATE, BY ANY ACT, WITH THE POLITICAL BODY, UNTIL THIS BLESSED REFORMATION HAS BEEN SECURED."

What is more solemn than a covenant—and one with God? Blessed be God that He condescends to covenant with His people! The history of the church has been one of covenanting. God covenanted with Noah; with Abraham; with Isaac; with Jacob. He covenanted with Israel and with David. He renewed His covenant time and time again. When in trouble they sought Him, He graciously renewed the covenants which they had so often broken. The New Testament Church is a Covenanting Church. The Reformations were times of special covenants. The Cov-

enanter Church has its roots in the National Covenant of Scotland, and the Solemn League and Covenant of the three kingdoms. These marked attainments never before reached by the visible church. They mark the advance line of battle in Christ's conquest of the world. The covenant of '71 still more clearly emphasizes the great truths and doctrines of these justly famous documents. Particularly does it set forth "dissent," and in these unmistakable terms: "We will continue to refuse to incorporate, BY ANY ACT, with the political body, until this blessed reformation has been secured."

This covenant was taken as a denomination. Its binding obligation is specifically stated in the Terms of Ecclesiastical Communion. It has been sworn to with uplifted hands before Almighty God. Upon the keeping of this covenant depend its blessings. We have no right to expect the fulfillment of its promises if we do not keep its obligations.

What shall we do with this covenant of '71, which binds us "to continue to refuse to incorporate, by any act, with the political body, until this blessed reformation has been secured?"

1st. That covenant can never be obliterated. It is written before God, and will meet every member of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in the judgment. It is laid up before the Cov-

enant God as indisputable evidence of the obligations under which the church has come.

2d. The covenant of '71 can be broken.

The fragments of broken covenants lie scattered all along the line of the church's history. God seems to leave the church to choose whether she will keep or break obligations freely entered into. It is remarkable how often she has willingly, knowingly and persistently broken her covenant vows.

> "The sons of Ephra'm, who nor bows
> Nor other arms did lack,
> When as the day of battle was,
> They faintly turnéd back.
> They broke God's covenant, and refused
> In His commands to go;
> His works and wonders they forgot,
> Which He to them did show."

3d. Covenants broken call down God's chastisements.

"For thus saith the Lord God: I will even deal with thee as thou hast done, which hast despised the oath in breaking the covenant." "And I will give the men that have transgressed my covenant, which have not performed the words of the covenant which they had made before me. . . . into the hand of their enemies and into the hand of them that seek their life." Such passages can be almost indefinitely multiplied.

They are God's solemn words to those who break their covenant vows.

4th. To break the covenant of '71 forfeits the blessings guaranteed, hinders the inflowing of the Spirit, and blights the work of the denomination.

If the covenant of '71 was entered into in the true spirit of covenanting then it follows (a): The denomination has promised that it will not incorporate with the political body by any act. (b): God has promised that He will give the power, the glory, the authority, in this nation, to His Son, Jesus Christ. But each party must keep the contract or the other is absolved. Further: IF EITHER PARTY BREAKS THE PROVISIONS OF THE COVENANT, HE THEREBY CONSENTS TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE OBLIGATIONS RESTING ON THE OTHER PARTY. If the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church breaks the covenant of '71 by leaving incorporation with the political body to "a conscientious and enlightened discretion," or by any act opens the doors to "suffrage," they consent to the withdrawal of Christ from these dominions as the "Governor of the nation."

IV. For the Covenanter Church to leave "voting," "holding office," "swearing allegiance to the Constitution, to the individual conscience," is to declare, by the highest authority in the church, and as *the representatives of Christ*, that these acts

are not sinful; or, if sinful, they should be allowed.

1st. If they are not sinful the denomination has stultified itself, dishonored God, proved itself an unsound interpreter of the Word of God, been a false teacher all these years, uttered false witness against sister denominations, and wronged the members who have adhered to the Covenanter faith.

2d. If they are sinful it will be the most solemn step the Covenanter Church has ever taken to declare before God, and a world struggling in darkness and asking guidance in the complex situations of life, that they should be allowed. It will be paralleled only by the indulgences of Rome.

V. In fine: It is believed that the Covenanter Church will not reject its testimony.

To do so would put back national reformation centuries. This is believed to be contrary to the purposes of God. The trend of the world's history is upward. It is out into the light, not into the darkness.

The Covenanter Church will live. God will not let it die. It may be reduced to societies, but it will live, and be the leaven which will yet leaven the nation.

In view of these things, it is said without the least hesitation, and in unbounded confidence in

the final triumph and vindication of the Covenanter's position of "dissent," that the present position of the Reformed Presbyterian Church should be strictly, consistently and faithfully maintained. On the threshold of the last great battle of the war, Gen. Grant asked Gen. Lee to surrender, that there be not further shedding of blood. The latter, in the true spirit of a vanquished but unconquered foe, returned the answer, "The time to surrender the Army of Virginia has not yet arrived."

CHAPTER XIV.

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE AND CIVIL OFFICE.

Allegiance, according to Webster, is "The tie or obligation, implied or expressed, which a subject owes to his prince or government." Allegiance to a government expresses a moral relation which makes you responsible for its acts. Allegiance to the government of the United States is entering into such relation on the basis of the declared Constitution. You become morally responsible to the same extent as if you had

framed, adopted, and were the executive of, the Constitution.

"Oath" is defined by Webster, "A solemn affirmation or declaration made with an appeal to God for the truth of what is affirmed."

It is clear from this definition that an oath brings nothing into existence. It is not its province to formulate principles, or provide conditions which call forth action. These antedate the oath. The principle and duty are recognized as right before the oath is used. The OATH DOES NOT CONSTITUTE OBLIGATION. Our allegiance to honesty lies back of any oath. The oath to the government of the United States does not create allegiance. The following is that part of the naturalization law applicable to the case in hand.

"He shall, at the time of his application, make oath that he will support the Constitution of the United States, and that he absolutely and entirely renounces and adjures all allegiance and fidelity to every foreign prince, potentate, state or sovereignty, particularly the state or sovereignty to which he has been a subject."

The allegiance expressed in this law may exist perfectly, and be regarded by God as sincere as well without the oath as with it. When a man swears allegiance he is calling on God to wit-

ness that he, in accepting the relation, is dealing honestly and truly. If all men were truthful and honest, the oath, in its connection with allegiance, might be removed. It in no sense constitutes the principle which the word "allegiance" represents. The latter may exist perfectly without the former. That this is the proper interpretation is seen from the fact that the large majority of the citizens of the United States (probably in the proportion of one thousand to one hundred) do not swear to their allegiance. But it exists, and God holds them responsible.

The government of the United States and of the States, under the authority of Constitutions, have created hundreds of thousands of offices.

These offices are to be filled by men who will carry out the will of the people as expressed in the Constitutions. The officers are not there without law, nor are they to be a "law unto themselves." If such be not true, the officer is absolute monarch. In a republic the officer fills an office CREATED BY THE CONSTITUTION, TO CONSERVE THE CONSTITUTION AND EXECUTE LAW MADE IN PURSUANCE THEREOF. In order that such end may be the more certainly attained, the government intensifies the obligation by causing the officer to "swear."

The question which presents itself is this: Can Covenanters, who dissolve their allegiance

by protest against, dissent from, and rejection of, the Constitution, fill these offices if no oath is required ?

If the question be answered in the affirmative, we have the strange spectacle of a hundred thousand offices filled by Covenanters who are administering law according to the specific requirements of a Constitution which they reject, yet claiming that they are not doing wrong because they did not SWEAR that they would do it. But filling an office created by the Constitution, or by law made in pursuance of it, does not require an oath to hold the officer who presents himself and is elected by the suffrage of the people, morally bound to administer the government according to the declared will of the people as expressed in the Constitution. Unless the officer presume to make and interpret law for himself, a position diametrically opposed to republican institutions, there is no other basis upon which he can act. The Covenanter who performs the feat of getting into office, be it President, Governor, or office of lesser note, has not been strictly honest. He has mentally reserved to himself the right to accept such laws and administer such laws as he thinks to be right, and to reject such as he thinks to be wrong, thus making himself the legislator, executive and judge of all under his authority. He does not

wait even for the church to say what should be, or what should not be, received as Divine law. It is only necessary to state that this kind of "side show" would not be permitted if understood. It is usurpation, and would result in absolute despotism.

The acceptance of official trust binds the incumbent, irrespective of any oath, to carry out the purposes of that office in the strictest integrity, according to the rules and laws when he accepted the position. If Ahithophal accepts office under Absalom, either with or without oath, he is guilty. It is not necessary to swear a pilot to bring him under obligations to direct the vessel to the port the owners desire. By accepting position he has surrendered preferences, and if he has mentally reserved to himself the right to direct the vessel according to his own desire, he would be and ought to be returned in irons. "But," answers the Covenanter politician, "I believe in God and would do only what is right." Very well. But it is still an open question whether sixty-five millions of people have the same confidence in your righteous ability, which personally is implicit. Not many would be willing to accept that kind of government—where the rulers are a law unto themselves. It has led to terrible results in the past, would do so in the present, and in the future.

We seem to have arrived at these conclusions :

First. He who accepts an office created by the Constitution or laws made in pursuance thereof, has yielded all personal preferences to the expressed will of the people.

Second. He who accepts an office mentally reserving to himself, and in conspiracy with others, the right to execute such laws ONLY AS HE BELIEVES TO BE FOR THE PUBLIC GOOD, is dishonest with the Constitution, and has the spirit of a despot.

Third. Having accepted official trust, the obligation to fulfil that trust according to the Constitution and laws creating it, stands irrespective of any oath. The oath creates neither the trust nor the obligation.

If these conclusions be correct, the statement that the Covenanter's "only barrier is the oath to the Constitution" is a fallacy. A very often misconstrued quotation from the historical part of Testimony (page 121), is this :

"Reformed Presbyterians have refused to serve in any office which implies an approbation of the Constitution, or which is placed under the direction of an immoral law."

As a matter of fact, there is not an office under the Constitution, the acceptance of which does not imply an "approbation of the Constitution." Nor is there an office in the government of the

United States, from President down, but that is under the "direction of an immoral law." It is accepted by Covenanters that the United States Constitution is atheistic, and therefore poisoned with the worst kind of immorality. But this Constitution is supreme law to every officer. His office comes in virtue of it, and his authority from it. When the captain issues an order to his company he does so in virtue of a standing commandment, or one then received from his superior officer, or the Commander-in-Chief in person. The Constitution is Commander-in-Chief, and directs every officer through subordinate laws. The Constitution reads:

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution and laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." (Art. VI, sec. 2.)

In the last resort the instructions to every officer are the Constitution and laws made in pursuance thereof. Every office is therefore placed under the direction of this Constitution which Covenanters witness against as immoral.

Some, in their study of this question, are in confusion here. They take three propositions from "The Two Sons of Oil," and endeavor to

prove that office may be held when the duties are right, and regulated by a just law. The three propositions are :

"1st. That the duties belonging to it [the office] be right in themselves.

"2d. That they be regulated by a just law.

"3d. That there be no other oath of office required, but faithfully to execute the official duties."

Let these propositions be illustrated. Suppose a Covenanter, politically inclined, looks over the office of County Treasurer. He finds that the duties are all right in themselves, such as a Christian could perform. (1st prop.) He finds that the little circle of laws with which he will have to do are just laws. (2d prop.) He will be permitted to take the office of County Treasurer without an oath. (3d prop.)

Can he do it? Several questions ask consideration.

1st. Who created that office? "We, the people!" and by a godless Constitution.

2d. Who gave him the office? "We, the people!" and by their own authority.

3d. By whose authority does he execute the duties of the office? By the authority of "We, the people!" God is not recognized from first to last. The whole power of the government stands ready to defend and support him. He therefore

wields a God-defying power. He fills an office created by the Constitution, and administers it by the authority of the Constitution, which Constitution declares the government is created and administered without God and any reference to His law. The Treasurer is part of the system. He is one of the officers of a godless government. He is wielding the power of a godless government. He is supporting the Constitution and government by becoming an integral part. It is therefore affirmed, believing that it cannot be successfully contradicted, that his relations are exactly the same as if he had taken oath. He is already supporting the Constitution by becoming an integral part of the government; he is discharging the duties which that Constitution imposes; he is doing the very things which he would do if he made oath. And to simply *swear* that he will do what he is now doing cannot be the point where guilt commences. In studying the Constitution, in all its ramifications and parts, in all its offices, officers and laws, let the oath be put to one side, remembering that the oath is only calling upon God to witness our sincerity.

THE OATH IS NOT A NECESSARY PART. The Constitution and government could exist without it quite as well as with it, if all were sincere. The three propositions of "The Two Sons of Oil" are, therefore, rejected, as generally interpreted,

as misleading. They leave out of view the fact that the offices are created and administered by an authority which openly and publicly and defiantly rejects the Lord Jesus Christ as Lawgiver, and King of the nation. The Covenanter cannot serve under such authority. When Joseph and Daniel accepted office, the proclamation that the true God is supreme rolled on to the uttermost boundaries of the kingdoms. But the proclamation of the United States Constitution is the rejection of God and His authority. Shall the Covenanter administer such authority, become its representative, the channel through which it flows? And while doing such things shall he excuse himself to the nation's rejected King by saying, "I did not *swear* that I would"?

The oath is a witness. It stands by, and asks God to stand by, and see that we mean to honestly serve the Constitution. If dispensed with, and the service is performed, the guilt would appear to be about the same. The conclusion arrived at is this: The Covenanter cannot hold any office or public trust under the Constitution and government of the United States, and no more without than with an oath.

CHAPTER XV.

THE WITNESSING CHURCH AND TEMPERANCE.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES.

It is not necessary, in this connection, to discuss the awfulness of the liquor traffic. Its greed and thirst for "blood," passing the ferocious beast, is something before which we stand amazed and stunned. It fears neither God nor man. In its wild career it plunges its dagger into friend and foe. To openly oppose it calls down the very wrath of Satan. The financial strength of the liquor traffic is something near one thousand millions of dollars. We can form little conception of this amount. It has grown to this from insignificant beginnings two generations ago. As it stands on the threshold of the generations to come, and with a thousand millions invested, with all the appliances necessary to growth, it becomes volcanic and cyclonic in possibilities. But the spread and growth of the business must rest on a corresponding increase in the number of drinkers and drunkards. God

forbid! May this NOT be! But it must be if the growth of the traffic continues. This bespeaks unmeasured suffering, unutterable sorrows, national desolation. Liquor interests already dominate. They hold strategic positions. They command the attention of the state and nation. They put down; they set up. Their frown is political death, their smile, political exaltation. But what to DO WITH THE MONSTER, so destructive, everywhere present, is confessedly one of the most serious and difficult problems which confront the States of the Union. It is one of the most gigantic evils known to modern civilization. That it should be licensed, and thus receive the protection and sanction of law, in nations which have the Gospel and the civilization which flows from it, shows great degradation, corruption and prostitution of power. It is DESPOTIC in tendency, and looks to the final overthrow of freedom. The government which will leave its subjects to the havoc of intemperance—to its poverty, its ruin, its death—will be found, ere long, an insufficient safeguard to other rights and liberties.

What shall be done with these workers of iniquity? Shall they be destroyed, their power to continue the evil taken away, or reformed? Some suggest:

I. THE DESTRUCTION OF THE EVIL DOERS.

There is an element of murder in the liquor

traffic. The kind of liquors sold; the poisons added; the ingredients which create a frenzied appetite; the murders committed through drink; the immorality and licentiousness always found with the traffic; the poverty and rags and misery which follow it—these are elements which define the moral character of the business. It is not putting it too strongly to say, *It murders.* If it does, all the lesser crimes in the catalogue leading up to it are also to be laid to the charge of the traffic.

Furthermore, the liquor power does not scruple to take life. This, not by the slow process of the drunkard's death, but by the bludgeon, the knife, the bullet. It does appear that the traffic is justly outlawed. More still: that those who aid and abet it should be destroyed. The drinker, also, comes in for condemnation. He is aiding the liquor dealers. He is assisting them. He fights under their flag. He espouses their cause. He is also a self-murderer. He is taking his own life. For this he is guilty before God. He murders the happiness of his family. He leaves them outcasts and vagabonds. It is an awful heritage he leaves his children. To claim liberty to do so is to claim liberty to shoot down.

What do those engaged in such business deserve? Are they entitled to protection? Are they entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happi-

ness? Should they be hanged, imprisoned, or fined? This is a serious question. But it is safe to say that the two hundred thousand and more men, say nothing of women and children, engaged in the liquor traffic, should not be destroyed. (This is not discussing particular cases.) We are all guilty of the violation of God's law in not a few particulars. The principle which would destroy them would react upon us all. Also, this is not God's method. He sent His Son to save. The two hundred thousand liquor dealers should be saved. The DESTRUCTION of these thousands of men and women and boys and girls is not to be thought of in the solution of the question. At the same time their case is aggravated. They reject the light. They put back the tears and prayers of suffering ones. They brutally treat their own victims. They pursue their infernal business with insatiable thirst. "DESTROY!" may yet be the necessary decree.

II. THE OVERTHROW OF THE POWER BY WHICH THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC OPPRESSES AND CORRUPTS MEN.

This looks to law and its enforcement; to constitutional measures; to local option, etc. Barring high license, low license, or any license whatsoever, these say to brewer, saloon keeper, and drinker, "Thou shalt not!" This is God's method of dealing with evil. It is His command to the

nations with reference to this evil. If brewer, saloon keeper or drinker breaks through the law, let him be imprisoned. We say IMPRISONED rather than fined. Fines are of little use. They help one another. If laws in keeping with the law of God were vigorously enforced, with severe punishment for violation, the power of the liquor traffic would be taken away. Great labor has been put forth, vast amounts of money expended to amend Constitutions, and enact laws to this end. It is along this line that nearly all efforts have been bent during the last fifteen years. But little progress has been made. Nine States have rejected constitutional prohibition. One State put it out of its Constitution. It is doubtful if those States which have it will be able to hold it. Politics in this nation is not to be depended on. It ebbs and flows; goes to a conclusion with tremendous sweep; recedes again into the very iniquity from which it was cleansed. "The dog returns to his vomit, and the sow that was washed to her wallow in the mire." Thus with unsanctified, godless politics. But civil government is God's institution; ordained for this very thing. "Rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil." "But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."

Civil government is the arm of God, mighty, omnipotent. But when civil government refuses to rise to the height of God's authority, and rejects His infinite wisdom set forth in Divine law, and insists upon groveling in the sordid narrowness of men's minds, and in enacting as law men's findings instead of God's, reforms labor under the most disheartening disadvantage, weary in thickening difficulties, and finally drop out of sight after years of arduous toil. (This phase of civil government will be more particularly considered in the following chapter.)

The liquor traffic desperately opposes this method of dealing with the problem of intemperance. It will willingly submit to low license or high license, but it does not want a prohibitory law. It brings mighty influence and power against the enactment of such law. It pours out money like water. It hires any number of workers.

But this is one of the strongest reasons, aside from direct Scriptural command, to deal with the traffic by outlawing it. But whether this is possible in a *godless*, *Bible-rejecting* government, is a serious question.

III. The reformation of the drinker, the saloon keeper, the brewer.

The reformation of those under the influence of, or engaged in, the liquor traffic is a most

discouraging and disheartening work. It is so much so that it has been all but abandoned during these years of efforts at amending Constitutions. And no wonder—results have been so small. Of difficult things the reformation of the drunkard seems to be the most difficult. He stands profuse with promises, but straightway falls into an awful drunken spree, more awful than those going before. What shall be done? One State after another says WE WILL HAVE THE TRAFFIC, and send an army of sixty thousand to the grave each year. And only a scant one here and there can be rescued. The thoughts of it are sufficient to produce great sadness and searchings of heart. These things may be said, however:

1st. These drunkards and manufacturers are not Christ's people.

2d. Ten go to hell through respectable morality and indifference to Christ, to one through intemperance. It is supposed that this nation numbers 65,000,000 souls. It is said that 60,000 go to drunkards' graves each year; or 2,000,000 in a generation. The number of professing Christians is about 10,000,000. Multiplying this by three, to surely cover children in Christian homes, and you have 30,000,000. Thus 32,000,000 of the sixty-five are accounted for. But what becomes of the other 33,000,000? This represents 1,000,000 a year for a generation. While 60,000

drunkards are going to the grave, 1,000,000 easy-going, outwardly respectable people have passed on to hell. In other words, while intemperance is casting one man into perdition, indifference to Christ is casting fifteen.

Furthermore, it is just as horrible to go to hell through respectable morality as intemperance. Nor does indifference to religion come through intemperance, but INTEMPERANCE THROUGH INDIFFERENCE TO CHRIST.

"I went by the field of the slothful, and by the vineyard of the man void of understanding; and lo, it was all grown over with thorns, and nettles had covered the face thereof, and the stone wall thereof was broken down." (Prov. xxiv: 30.) Without Christ we are a prey to all forms of wickedness, intemperance with the others. But "The name of the Lord is a strong tower; the righteous runneth into it and are safe."

1st. All efforts at reformation will fail where they seek to reform the drunkard from his cups only. The many years' experience justify this conclusion.

2d. The reformation which leads to Christ, UNION WITH HIS CHURCH, with all that these imply, will be successful.

3d. The grace of God is amply sufficient for the regeneration of the drunkard's soul. True, the Scripture says, "No drunkard shall inherit the

kingdom of God." But it says the same of the "covetous," of "revilers," of "extortioners." The implication is that all can be cleansed by the grace of God, and one as readily as the other. These can be convicted of sin and be brought to Christ.

4th. Intemperance illustrates and establishes the iniquity of man; the pollution of his soul; the crying need of the Gospel.

What better opportunity could the church desire, when sin is so positively illustrated? Anybody, everybody, can see the need of the Gospel, the saving grace of God, when sin is thus running rampant and overleaping all restraint. The situation should awaken the church. Here is a mighty evil. What louder call for the immediate application of the Gospel! Even the church sometimes loses her keenness of edge. In Maine, statistics show that one-third of the churches are either closed or without a pastor. God is illustrating throughout this great nation, forcefully, clearly, emphatically, the need of the church, and at the same time awakening the church by the desperate character of the evil to the serious responsibility resting on her. If the church cannot cope with the liquor traffic in this land of Christian advantage and prestige, how can she cope with idolatry in lands covered with dense heathen darkness? But a consecrated church does cope with

idolatry and scatter it to the winds, planting the religion of Jesus, and unfurling His glorious banner. So can a consecrated church do with intemperance. To do this the church must:

1st. Put away the evil from herself.

The church, in heathen lands, which tries to carry worshipers of idols is powerless against the sin of idolatry. The church which receives drinkers and brewers, etc., is in no condition to expect a victory. She must get the victory over herself. First. Is it to be wondered at that prohibition failed in so many States when the church has not come up to the standard of prohibition? "Physician, heal thyself." The church as a moral force cannot thrust the nation up to a prohibition standard when she will not take it herself. There is an eternal fitness of things. One of these is for the church to incorporate prohibition in her standards. This will soon produce a prohibition Christian church. Thus cleared of the evil, she will be like Gideon's "three hundred," who shouted, "The sword of the Lord and of Gideon!" There can be no doubt as to the power of the church in this nation. If the church publicly professed prohibition, not by flashy resolutions, but by incorporating the doctrine in the standards of the denominations, she could put that doctrine in the Constitution of any State in the Union. Her voice would be recognized as the

voice of God. Now, the state sees the confusion of Babel; no denomination, except one or two very small ones, one of these the Covenanter, requiring the profession of prohibition as a Scripture doctrine. In this matter the great Christian church has made a mistake. With her skirts defiled with the iniquitous traffic, harboring the drinker and brewer, she goes to the state and demands that the state shall guard its subjects from the destroyer. THE CHURCH MUST WASH HER ROBES (from this iniquity) and MAKE THEM WHITE IN THE BLOOD OF THE LAMB; then she can wield the grace of Almighty God as a converting power. With a purified church, the liquor traffic must fall. It will not bear the light of the Son of Righteousness. "They overcame him BY THE BLOOD OF THE LAMB, AND THE WORD OF THEIR TESTIMONY." The awful floods of intemperance can be stayed by these means to-day. "The Lord's hand is not shortened that it cannot save; nor His ear heavy that it cannot hear."

2d. The church must preach, and more emphatically, that liquor drinking is a SIN against God, and a crime against man.

The saloon keeper and manufacturer have been soundly berated, and justly. Not one good word can be said for them or their business. They are the outcasts of society, the vagabonds of the earth. They are robbers and liars and murderers to

a man. But the drinker sins also: (a) He produces the demand. If no drinkers, the supply would cease. The growing supply indicates a growing demand, hence an increase in the number of drinkers. The consumer is all but worthy of as severe condemnation as the saloon keeper and manufacturer. (b) The drinker sins against his home. He robs the home. He brings his family to poverty. They are not decently clothed or fed. He is brutal in his treatment. (c) He sins against the community. He comes on the community for support. Saturated with disease through rum, he and his family come to be a public charity. (d) He spreads moral pestilence. Immorality goes with rum. The back rooms to saloons are awful places, full of all abominations. He who goes in the front will be found in the rear. (e) He sins against God in his own soul. He is defacing God's image in drowning his soul in liquor. The awful nature of his sin is seen from God's withering rebuke and curse upon it, which soon cast out of the earth into hell.

Liquor drinking a SIN? It is so great a sin that God will not permit such wicked people to live! "God is a consuming fire," and consumes the drinking sinner *more quickly* than any other. The church has not sufficiently emphasized the SIN OF DRINKING. Long strides, however, have been taken in this direction during the last gen-

eration. The church is growing in the discharge of this duty. The drinker is no more worthy of compassion than the thief, the blasphemer, the Sabbath-breaker, the perjured person. When the great church of Christ deals with drinking as a SIN AGAINST GOD, the business has received its death-blow.

3d. There should be more positive temperance sentiment in the home, coupled with parental authority.

Many boys go to ruin through parental carelessness. The boys are out—they do not know where. Some parents have no more care of their children than animals of their young. They are left without moral training. There should be unmistakable authority in the home, which kindly but firmly rules. It is no kindness to children to allow them to have their way. The child who learns submission, as it grows into a knowledge of God, learns that He is the Father indeed, to whom obedience is to be rendered. But the child whose parents do not teach it to obey has received a wrong at the hands of its parents which leaves it a prey to the saloon, for it goes where it wishes. It has also been taught to disregard the authority of God. Such boys and girls are, in nearly all cases, lost to the church, and recruit the ranks of the profane and the vile. Parents are to blame. God commands

to "train up a child," to conscientiously teach it its duty. But multitudes of parents turn this work over to others. The interests of temperance are closely linked with parental authority. The home must be toned up, and the boys will be saved. The devil gets but few boys and girls out of the homes where there is a positive Christianity and the fear and love of God. If all Christian parents in the United States would do their duty to their boys and girls in this matter of training, teaching them obedience which leads to obedience to God, a long step has been made toward the overthrow of the liquor traffic.

4th. The church must become more spiritual and pious.

The avenues leading out into the wilderness of sin are not beset by a thoroughly consecrated church as they should be. Thirty millions in this land of churches without any pretense of Christianity! Astonishing! The church needs more thorough consecration! She needs a stronger piety! She needs to pray more, and live nearer to God. The church must be toned up through and through. A half-hearted Christianity cannot meet the terrible conflicts of to-day. The Sabbath paper, Sabbath visiting, Sabbath pleasuring, theatre going, dancing, card playing, unsanctified lives, want of Bible study, etc., have well nigh defeated the work of the church in many places.

God will not do many mighty temperance works, or give many mighty temperance victories, until the church lives closer to Him and becomes more spiritual. It is a fact which can be proved, taking the church as a whole, that any member who can keep out of the clutches of the civil law is unmolested in the church. This shows corruption in the church. If she will not deal with evil within, how can she with evil without? Israel had to put away their idols and sanctify themselves before God gave them deliverance from their oppressors. Neither will God do so to-day, except the church rise to purer life and more consecrated devotion. There is nothing in all the history of the world to show that God will remove, FROM BEFORE A CORRUPT CHURCH, oppressors which hinder and stop the way. Reforms come by the church being reformed FIRST. Nor is it sufficient for the church to be reformed in the matter of temperance only. There must be reform all along the line. There has been gradual decline in spirituality in the denominations for two or three generations. Is it to be wondered at that God rebukes us and renders us powerless before the wickedness of to-day?

We have unbounded confidence in the ability of the church to cope with the liquor traffic, but she must publicly adopt prohibition in her standards; she must take a higher position in piety,

spirituality, consecration. She cannot overcome the evil of intemperance in her present condition. These conditions fulfilled, the liquor traffic must perish before her withering rebuke, and before the trumpet blasts of the Gospel. "The Gospel is the power of God," and such a church will wield it. To hope for prohibition, the church continuing in her present unsanctified state, unwilling to be pure and to be holy, "to put away her idols," is to hope knowing that the conditions of promised victory have not been fulfilled. In all the temperance contests up to this time, the church has fought herself. Not a few of her members, no insignificant part of her forces, no small part of her army, have been found in the enemy's ranks. She was thus fighting herself. Until the church is on ONE SIDE, until she is more spiritual and holy, until she consecrates herself more fully to the interests of Christ's kingdom, until she puts away worldliness and pride and vanity, there is but little if any hope of national prohibition.

5th. In fine: Emancipation from this destroyer, as an individual or nation, can be had only in the REGENERATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR NATION.

This means that the individual must come to Christ. It means that the nation must do likewise. There is no hope of the individual whose reformation does not *take him to the church, put him*

on his knees, and in humble supplication seek "the living God with his whole heart and mind." THE SAME IS EXACTLY TRUE OF THE NATION. As experience demonstrates the fallacy of the drunkard's profession of reformation, unless he give evidence of a changed heart, so will experience show that it is useless to try to get a nation, unregenerate in heart, infidel in life, openly wicked in transgression, to "sign the pledge and keep it." This nation must be brought to Christ. These sixty-five millions of people must bow at the feet of King Jesus. There must be public profession of His name, as the nation's Lord and as the nation's God. Then will the liquor traffic be destroyed. Oh, what bright prospects, just beyond, if this nation would come to Christ! How He entreats and pleads with us as a people! There is no hope of prohibition, final, successful, lasting, in these United States, until we as a nation bow humbly before our God, render Him national homage and worship, and BRING FORTH THE CROWN, MEET ONLY FOR THE SON OF GOD, AND PLACE IT ON THE BROW OF JESUS!

CHAPTER XVI.

EFFORTS AT CONSTITUTIONAL PROHIBITION IN A GODLESS GOVERNMENT.

WORK has been done on lines other than efforts at constitutional prohibition. Earnest temperance workers are abroad in the land. Scientific temperance instruction (this somewhat visionary) is given by the command of State authority in some States. But, after all, the great bulk of effort, in this last decade, has been to secure constitutional prohibition. Everybody had great hopes and expectations from this line of work. It did appear that the monster was about to be chained and cast into the pit. But hopes have been not a little disappointed. True, there has been some success. But when it is remembered that nine States in TWO years rejected constitutional prohibition, one of these striking prohibition from its Constitution, these successes lose their importance, and especially since it is not yet demonstrated that such States will be able to retain their constitutional provision. In two years the following States rejected prohibition:

West Virginia, Michigan, Tennessee, Texas, Oregon, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island. The last named went "back to its vomit and to its wallow in the mire." Most of these are great and important Commonwealths. That they should vote to retain the "destroyer," to pet and fatten the monster which is living on human flesh and blood, is an awful commentary on the standard of morality in these States. It is only the figures that make us believe that one of the greatest and most cultivated and wealthiest of these States voted a whisky majority of one hundred and eighty-three thousand. Astonishing! It will be more so to generations to come. The matter of constitutional prohibition of the liquor traffic has not yet been sufficiently tested, as a remedy, to draw a conclusion acceptable to all. For ourselves, we have but little hope of a thorough-going temperance reformation through Constitutions which reject God and the authority of His law. We do not hesitate to make this statement, viz.: TEMPERANCE REFORM WILL NEVER COME THROUGH THE UNSANCTIFIED, GODLESS BALLOT BOX. There will be ebbs and flows of sentiment. Victories may be gained in constitutional law. But there are mighty hindrances to final success on this line. The amendment proposed to the Constitution of Pennsylvania was not unlike, but like, all others

seeking prohibition. Reasons why this amendment failed will be suggested, believing that they apply to all.

I. THE DEFEAT OF THE TEMPERANCE AMENDMENT IN PENNSYLVANIA WAS NOT DUE TO THE USE OF MONEY.

Admitted, money was used. It was used lavishly. Hundreds of thousands of dollars were contributed by brewers, saloon keepers and political tricksters. They hired workers by the multitudes to fiercely contend against the amendment at the polls. All this is admitted. But while all this is true, it is equally true that their money had to be spent on men like themselves. It was spent on whisky bums, thugs, prize fighters, worthless characters, and men in sympathy with the evil, who would have voted that way. Any man who is not above price is worthless in a moral contest. The money consideration put them just where they belonged. They would be out of place elsewhere. If they had voted in the affirmative they would have voted next day to strike out the amendment. Such classes swarm in this government and receive unjustifiable consideration.

II. Prohibition was defeated in Pennsylvania, because THEY HAVE NO STANDARD OF RIGHT.

With the public declaration that "The majority shall rule," and their will shall be executed by

the authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, prohibition was put up. The majority said, "*No! We want whisky!*" and they have whisky by the voice of the people. Laws protecting the traffic are executed by the organized political body in which prohibitionist and saloon keeper stand side by side. Does it not appear that RIGHT was delivered up to crucifixion when it was declared, in supreme law, that WRONG shall be enthroned as often as the majority see fit? Everybody in Pennsylvania who voted, Covenanters who voted along with others, agreed that the will of the majority in the matter of the liquor traffic should be the supreme law. There is no known higher law than majorities. This is the theory of the government. To this, all who voted agreed. Since the majority voted in "whisky," and protect it by law, all who voted become sharers in the public wrong and disgrace, since the agreement is, "The majority shall rule." Every one who swears allegiance to the Constitution of the United States, voting or holding office under it, has thus publicly attested that he will be governed by the will of the majority. The minority, in Pennsylvania should, after all, be very mild in their rebukes of the majority. They left God's law out of their Constitution, and declared that majorities should settle all questions. True, this is not the way God says to do. He

gives no intimation that men may sit thus in judgment on His decrees. But in Pennsylvania they determined to do so anyway. No wonder the results make them stare one another in the face. They carry a fearful responsibility. However, they have what they asked for, the rule of the majority, and it is whisky. The government, in the name of all citizens in allegiance, declares the result. Results rest, therefore, on all who voted, without reference to "side." Since the majority has declared for whisky and associated immoralities, the good Christian people of Pennsylvania should seriously ponder two things : 1st. THE THEORY OF GOVERNMENT. 2d. THE RELATION IN WHICH THE MAJORITY PRINCIPLE FINDS THEM IN THE EXECUTION OF LAWS WHICH ESTABLISH AND PROTECT THE INIQUITOUS TRAFFIC. A thorough study of the first will make them national reformers ; of the second, COVENANTERS.

This majority principle on which the government rests, and without reference to RIGHT or WRONG, is one element of difficulty in all moral reforms. Surrender to immorality the privilege of "establishing iniquity by law" if it can muster a majority, and you have surrendered the citadel. This has been done by the Constitution of the United States.

At the same time, it must be remembered that there is each year a large influx of foreigners, of

the worst elements of Eastern countries, who are not in sympathy with temperance. The nation is growing at the rate of three and one-fourth persons every minute, one hundred and ninety-four every hour, or about 1,700,000 in a year. A reliable authority gives these estimates of classes in our population :

"Of the sixty-six millions of people probably ten will be found of foreign birth, about nine of the colored race, and forty-seven native-born whites ; but of the latter perhaps eight millions will be found children of foreign-born parents. With about twenty-seven millions of foreign birth or parentage, or colored, and thirty-nine million inhabitants essentially American and white, the American will ask himself whether continued and unrestricted immigration has any danger for this country. A considerable part of the children of foreign parentage become in every respect essentially Americans, but the body remaining, which retains foreign interests, sympathies, habits and associations, IS LARGE AND INCREASING."

It is of no value in a stupendous struggle, as for prohibition, to push aside facts, or refuse to accord them their proper significance. The situation warrants the statement that fully one-third of the population, with increasing proportion, is foreign or of foreign parentage. They are here with their foreign ideas, tastes and habits, have

practically foreign communities even whole counties and cities within cities. They can be put down as opposed to prohibition ; in most cases as bitterly opposed. Of the 1,700,000, which is about the yearly growth of the nation, the large majority can be counted in the opposition. In New York City, with 80 per cent. foreigners, what hope is there of prohibition? And the situation is daily becoming worse! Not only in New York, but in all the land! These foreigners are BEING NATURALIZED BY MULTITUDES AND MULTITUDES! They here and there already hold the balance of power and are in control! They are courted and petted, dined and wined by politicians! They are hurried into naturalization for their votes! Once in, they have equal rights in OVERTURNING INSTITUTIONS, with the native-born in maintaining them!

The far-reaching effects of the awful mistake made by the founders of our government are beginning to be seriously felt. They should have declared in the Constitution that "The law of God is the foundation of the laws and institutions of this land." Naturalization would then have sworn foreigners to this standard. This, instead of leaving them to tear down, uproot, destroy, would have brought them into harmony with American ideas and our Christian institutions. That would have been controlling the stream at

its source. But now the stream is fierce and mighty.

Corrupt politics are also in the interests of the foreigners. They are hunted after by the political demagogue and his henchmen. Being such multitudes of them, and being clannish, they are important political factors. They are given their way as a political bribe, until at last they *demand* their way. They learn the character of the government very quickly. They soon learn that the morality of the government can be voted up or voted down, according to the ever-changing moral complexion of the people. It appears that the citadel has been surrendered when these classes were given the elective franchise WITHOUT BINDING THEM TO THE LAW OF GOD. The situation does not inspire confidence.

III. The amendment was defeated in Pennsylvania because GOD WAS RULED OUT OF THE CONTEST BY THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND.

True, many prayers were put up to God, through Christ, during the campaign. But they were estopped by the theory of government. Multitudes called on God for "help" in this time of need. But the unuttered part of such prayers was, "If the majority says 'Rum,' we have agreed to accept it, and execute laws to that end!" Could God enter the contest on such conditions? There was no covenant on the part

of the Christian people that they would separate from the evil, and would refuse all allegiance to the government which would "establish iniquity by law." This because they feared God. No. Their political relations were to continue as before. They wished God's help to deliver them from the liquor traffic, but they did not ask God to take any further part in the government. The government which claims that its authority comes from "the people," that God has no part or lot in the matter, is not in condition to look but to "*the people*" for help. *They can expect to wield no greater power than the source from whence they draw their authority.* If God were recognized as this source, His infinite power could be laid under contribution. But He is rejected and the authority of His law denied—this by the supreme law of the land. The situation is as if an Israelite who had espoused the cause of Absalom, should, notwithstanding his treason, appeal to David, now exiled, dethroned, rejected, but the King nevertheless, to come to their aid in putting down an immorality in Ephraim, but with the understanding that he was not to be enthroned, for "all Israel loved Absalom," as "we, the people," are loved in this land.

Therefore, rejecting God, not only as Ruler, but also His *power*, for "He does not many mighty works" where there is "unbelief" as to

His authority in civil government, the good people of Pennsylvania went into a contest with the "rum devil." If ever they needed God in government, surely they did then. If ever they needed to wield the omnipotent arm, that was the time. But they went into the battle leaving God exiled without the camp. As a result, they were overwhelmingly defeated. "Without ME ye can do nothing."

Sabbath reform is also beginning to feel that God should be divorced from it, being, it is alleged, a stumbling-block. They urge the Sabbath on the ground of civil law, not on the authority of God's command. They are using efforts to keep the Divine side of the Sabbath in the background. The Sabbath is urged as a day of needed rest, and on the authority of the people. The bill now before Congress is objected to by some because they believed it appealed to Divine law for its support.

The editor of *Pearl of Days*, who is an officer in the American Sabbath Union, hastens to clear the bill of this misconception (?) and affirms its divorcement from Divine law. (What unfortunate conclusions a Constitution divorced from God drives men to!) "The opposition," says the editor, "to Senator Blair's Sabbath Rest bill, introduced into the Senate December 9, 1889, and printed in the *Pearl of Days* last

week, is based upon a false assumption. THAT BILL DOES NOT ASSUME, AS IT IS CLAIMED, THAT CIVIL LEGISLATION UPON THIS SUBJECT APPEALS TO THE DIVINE LAW FOR ITS SUPPORT. NOTHING OF THIS KIND APPEARS IN THE BILL. ON THE CONTRARY, THE OPPOSITE IS DECLARED."

It requires no prophetic inspiration to show the "end from the beginning" of efforts at "Sabbath rest" without God; therefore, the complete defeat of the measure now pending before the Congress of the United States. "Without Me ye can do nothing." The Christian features of our government are being trampled beneath the heel of the infidel, the saloon keeper, the Sabbath breaker, the profane, the vile. The mighty godless corporations are grinding the day of rest beneath their ponderous wheels. At the same time some good Christian people insist that God should be surrendered up from the Christian hosts! When WILL we learn, even as Christians, "WITHOUT ME YE CAN DO NOTHING"?

We say it without fear of successful contradiction: UNLESS THIS NATION ENTHRONES GOD, THE TEMPERANCE CAUSE IS HOPELESS. This, the mightiest and most dreadful evil known to modern civilization, can be driven out only by the power of Almighty God. This can be secured only by the nation bowing at the feet of King Jesus.

All efforts should be, first, to bring back the

Lord, the King; to place in His hand the scepter; to bow before Him as the nation's "Lawgiver, Executive and Judge." The public conscience should be pierced and smitten with this great truth until it glows and melts into one mighty determination to "crown Him Lord of all!"

Nothing but the fear of God and His commanding authority will make men honor His law. So long as He is ruled out of the contest, and by public declaration "known and read of all men," it is useless to expect any great manifestation of His power in the overthrow of evil. The good people of Pennsylvania, therefore, digged the ditch into which they fell, as they were buried under a whisky majority of one hundred and eighty-three thousand. God was ruled out of the contest by the specifications of the Constitution of the United States. "The heathen are sunk down in the pit that they made: in the net which they hid is their own foot taken." (Ps. ix: 15.)

IV. The amendment was rejected in Pennsylvania because THE PROFANE AND THE VILE, THOSE WHO REJECT GOD AND WHO OPENLY BLASPHEME HIS NAME, WERE PERMITTED TO SIT IN JUDGMENT ON HIS LAW.

This is a serious evil, as it is a dishonor to "Christ, the King of nations." The harm is not so distinctly seen, and its fruits are not

so apparent when two great political parties divide these bad elements and balance them against each other as in a common election. But when some great moral issue is before the people; when suffering humanity loudly demands the application of righteous restraining law; when such issue is settled at the ballot-box, these bad elements, the PROFANE and the VILE; the PRIZE FIGHTERS, THUGS and BUMMERS; the BREWERS, SALOON KEEPERS and DRUNKARDS; WHOREMONGERS, MURDERERS OF FATHERS AND MURDERERS OF MOTHERS; ADULTERERS and THIEVES and ROBBERS and OUTLAWS; these all flow together in determined and fierce opposition.

If republicanism be Scriptural, and we believe it is, we are not convinced that Christ, who sits enthroned over properly constituted civil government, says to His enemies, "You have equal privileges with those who own my authority; you shall have equal voice in choosing officers and making laws." The elective franchise is unrighteously extended to those who reject God, blaspheme His name, and make themselves abhorred in His presence. It is a false theory of government which teaches that Christ is King, and at the same time teaches that His enemies should have the rights of suffrage. Christ commands His subjects to obey Him, puts them under disability until they do, instead of commis-

sioning them to unseat Him if they can. The qualifications named by Christ for His officers, "*Able* men, SUCH AS FEAR GOD," suppose the same in those who make the choice. But in this government the very worst drunken sot is held up on his feet and led to the polls. What an insult this is to Him who is the nation's Ruler! Does Christ say to a man who makes the very air blue with blasphemy, "You have as much right to your vote for wickedness, as my most devoted follower for righteousness?" The good people of this land have surrendered themselves to this class and have sworn that they will be obedient if these can muster a majority. That is a surrender which they had no right to make, inasmuch as it is surrendering what belongs to Christ. But they made it. What better advantage could wickedness ask? It made a little spurt over in Pennsylvania, and put down the right by one hundred and eighty-three thousand majority! These shameless, wicked, God-defying classes are politically (contrary to the commandment, "Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers,") yoked with Christian people, with all the possibilities in wickedness which these good people may be dragged into, and be made, by such union, responsible for. There is something wrong! For the man on his knees and the man who blasphemes to be put side by

side is nowhere intimated or hinted at in Scripture ; this, either in church or state. Civil government is DIVINE as well as the church, and is watched over with as jealous eye by the Lord God Almighty.

In a government which owns God and His authority the blasphemer is out of place at the polls. In a government which rejects God and casts out His law the Christian is out of place at the polls. And any attempt to "yoke them together" will do two things : 1st. It will make the Christian forget God in politics. 2d. It will bring down the government, eventually, to the level of the worst.

That these are not visionary opinions may be gathered from the fact that they are advocated, although, cautiously, by some of the prominent thinkers of the land. One of America's most noted ministers—we refer to Dr. Lyman Abbott—in a sermon preached to his people on Dec. 29, 1889, produced lines of thought which are parallel to those presented. Let the reader judge of his words :

"Two conceptions of government," said Dr. Abbott, "have been in existence since the foundation of our republic, struggling each with the other. One of these conceptions—the one which seems at present to have been nearly extinguished—is the conception founded on the faith

of the Puritan. According to it, GOVERNMENT WAS A DIVINE INSTITUTION, based not on the Divine right of kings, but on the Divine right of the people. So that the Puritans ALLOWED ONLY CHURCH MEMBERS TO TAKE PART IN POLITICAL AFFAIRS, and the magistrate's office was as religious as that of the minister.

"In opposition to this conception came that of the French Revolutionists and the school of Thomas Jefferson. Their view of government made it an entirely secular affair. NOT A DIVINE INSTITUTION, BUT A NECESSARY EVIL. This view is the one which seems more and more to prevail. A RETURN TO THE OLD BELIEF, THAT GOVERNMENT IS RELIGIOUS IN ITSELF, . . . IS NECESSARY TO COUNTERACT THE DANGEROUS TENDENCIES OF THE AGE. Not that the church should come into connection with the state, BUT THAT THE FUNCTIONS OF THE STATE SHOULD BE EXERCISED RELIGIOUSLY."

After speaking of political corruption, the spoil system, the buying and selling of votes, the power of evil men, he continued:

"Consider the question whether, if the Puritans were wrong in giving the vote ONLY TO CHURCH MEMBERS, WE ARE NOT EQUALLY WRONG IN GIVING IT TO EVERYBODY."—(*New York Times*, *Dec. 30th*, *'89.*)

This is one of the elements which contributed

to the defeat of the temperance amendment in Pennsylvania. As the classes referred to above have as much political power as the people of God, as they have full authority to vote in what they like, and out what they dislike; as all, even the most important and vital questions, are to be settled by majorities, as the highest standard of RIGHT, and as GOD IS RULED OUT OF THE CONTEST, it is not altogether foolish to say the outlook for reforms which seek recognition in constitutional law is not encouraging. There are tremendous difficulties to encounter. "Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles? A good tree (Christian Constitution) cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree (Infidel Constitution) bring forth good fruit."

To the writer, therefore, the road to finally successful temperance reform and prohibition lies in the sanctification of government in these three things:

First. THE ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF ALMIGHTY GOD AND THE AUTHORITY OF HIS SON JESUS CHRIST OVER THE NATION.

Second. THE PUBLIC RECOGNITION AND AVOWAL OF GOD'S LAW AS THE STANDARD OF RIGHT.

Third. THE DISQUALIFICATION OF ALL WHO WILL NOT SWEAR ALLEGIANCE TO GOD AND HIS LAW.

The yearly consumption of malt liquors in the United States for each inhabitant was, for the

year 1840, 1.36 gallons; for 1850, 1.58 gallons; for 1860, 3.22 gallons; for 1870, 6.61 gallons; for 1880, 9.51 gallons; for 1885, 11.51 gallons; for 1888, 12.48 gallons. This means that there is TWELVE TIMES AS MUCH CONSUMED NOW, per capita, as fifty years ago. And during the last ten years, the decade of amendments, the consumption of malt liquors has increased per capita, from 9.51 gallons to 12.48 gallons. This enormous increase in the consumption of liquors is the more remarkable when it is remembered that, during this decade, two States have come under prohibition rule, which, with Maine, represent one-eighteenth of the territory of the United States (exclusive of Alaska); and also about one-eighteenth of the population of the country. In many other States, also, towns and townships are, under local option, having prohibition rule. If the people of these States and towns and townships do not sell any, as they say they do not, if they do not take any, as they claim, the consumption per capita in other States is materially increased.

The above statistics show that the growth of the traffic has far outstripped the growth of the population. Are we to become a nation of drunkards? Think of 12.48 gallons for each man, woman and child! One-third of a barrel to each of the sixty-five millions of people! If ever a na-

tion owed a duty to its suffering, bleeding, dying subjects, this nation NOW owes immediate, thorough, uncompromising PROHIBITION!

BUT PROHIBITION WILL NOT COME THROUGH A GODLESS BALLOT BOX. No! The people must come up before the Lord, and covenant with Him to be His people, and He will covenant with them to be their God. This is the first step to finally successful and lasting prohibition. How touchingly, therefore, the suffering, the misery and death, because of the traffic, appeal to the great heart of the nation to ENTHRONE GOD AND CRUSH THE MONSTER!

CHAPTER XVII.

COVENANTERS AND VOTING FOR AMENDMENTS.

THE Covenanter Church, with others, is pierced and stricken with the awfulness of the liquor traffic, which pours its victims, as the thunders of Niagara, hissing and cursing into hell. It is not strange, therefore, that, in this the decade of amendments, the denomination should be severely tried politically. Perhaps the last ten years

have put its principles to the severest tests of any similar period. The debated question is, *Is it consistent for Covenanters to vote for amendments?* Those who think that the "corrupt tree" (the godless Constitution) can be forced to yield "good fruit," and who think that, by such voting, you do not incorporate with the government, or, by implication, give allegiance to the Constitution, say, "YES." Those of the opposite opinion say, "No."

It is believed that, up to the Synod of 1889, the deliverances on the question had been against voting. The various decisions could be produced, but this would be of no value. The decision of Synod of 1889 sets all doubt at rest by showing how the church stands now. Perhaps two years ago such decision would not have been given, at least by such remarkable majority. Nor is it believed that it would be given on this, the first day of 1890, by such majority. Perhaps some of the good brethren in Pennsylvania, if they could be heard, after an adverse majority of one hundred and eighty-three thousand, would be more willing to believe that it is difficult to carry a temperance amendment without God, and on the strength of "we, the people." However, it requires a crisis to produce the real sentiments of some, even in Synod. The recent deliverance is believed to voice the judgment of the highest court in the

Reformed Presbyterian Church. These are the words of it :

" There are certain acts that do not involve sinful relations to an irreligious Constitution of government, and which are not acts of incorporation with the government, which this church has always recognized the right of her members to perform.

" The simple act of voting for amendments to State Constitutions belongs to the class of political acts which are not inconsistent with the principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church or with her position of political dissent."

One hundred and twenty members voted for this deliverance. Forty-four voted against it. Four members did not vote. Six were absent. Twenty-eight members entered their dissent against it with reasons therefor.

It is believed that this decision is adverse to the principles of the Covenanter Church, and for the following, among other reasons :

I. Synod has commissioned the members of the church to JOIN WITH THE CITIZENS OF THIS LAND IN ADMINISTERING THE GOVERNMENT.

Synod says: " Go, vote for amendments !" The matter is not limited to temperance amendments. The principle is the same if there was this limitation. But it is a broad commission. It covers all amendments of whatever character. It should

be remembered that nearly every legislature, in the various States, propose amendment or amendments to the Constitutions of such States. In Ohio, there were three amendments voted on at the elections in the fall of 1889. Thus through all the States. Synod says to the people of the church, "Voting for amendments to State Constitutions" is right. The field is thus opened. But such commission given by Synod is believed to be wrong, because :

1st. The only recognized authority in this land is "we, the people." Whatever is done is done in their name and by their authority. They have openly, and to all the nations, declared that they recognize no God and no higher law than their own.

2d. If the Covenanter can join them in official action, in voting up or voting down, a Constitution or part of a Constitution, and be guiltless before God, neither then is the nation guilty when it legislates and has legislated without God.

3d. A constitutional amendment is but a STANDING ORDER TO THE OFFICERS UNDER COMMAND OF "WE, THE PEOPLE."

A Constitution is but a command. The trouble with the Constitution of the United States is not with itself, but with the people who issued it as a command on their own authority. The command—

Constitution—should have recognized the authority above the people, the authority of God. Covenanters testify against the people for doing this. The people meet together again to issue another STANDING ORDER to officers. They are going to do it on their own authority as before. If it was wrong before, it is still wrong. The trouble is NOT with the order, but with the *authority which issues it.* Every one who joins that rebellious authority is guilty before God, however good the commands they issue may be in themselves. That same rebellious authority acts in adopting every Constitution and *every constitutional amendment.* In that authority which makes Constitutions and amendments is where *broods and rests and roots* the source of the rebellion against God. *To enter that rebellious body and make Constitutions and amendments is believed to be a sin of much greater magnitude than any other in connection with the government. It is joining the conspiracy against God and His Christ!*

That conspiracy puts out Constitutions and amendments, issuing them as commands to their officers in charge of national affairs. Shall the Covenanter have his name to commands which come from this conspiracy? Shall he be one of "we, the people," who has officers under him to whom he can issue orders? Every time a Constitution is made, that conspiracy acts. Every time a constitutional amendment is made, that

conspiracy acts. *The Constitutions and amendments are but the products of the conspiracy against God.*

4th. For the Covenanter to issue such STANDING ORDER to officers, commanding them to proceed on certain lines, and do certain work, and knowing that the officer, to do so, must take the oath of allegiance to the Constitution, brings the Covenanter immediately responsible for swearing such oath. For illustration: When the Covenanter issues a STANDING ORDER TO THE OFFICERS OF THE STATE TO RID THE STATE OF ALL INTOXICATING LIQUORS, AND PUNISH HENCEFORTH ALL WHO MANUFACTURE OR SELL THE SAME, and knowing, at the time he issues the order, that the officer must take the oath to the godless Constitution to do this thing, HE COMMANDS HIM TO TAKE THAT OATH.

5th. Since the officer must take the oath to carry out the command of the Covenanter, in the matter of temperance, it involves the same principle, no more, no less, to vote for the officer. The authority which can issue a command can choose, as the command assumes he has chosen, the officer to carry it into execution. TO ISSUE A COMMAND TO OFFICERS WHO MUST TAKE THE OATH TO EXECUTE IT, and KNOWINGLY SO, and then turn about, and with hands uplifted to Almighty God, swear that the officer does wrong to take the oath of allegiance, will not, it is believed, com-

mend the consistency of the Covenanter Church. It may be an adroit shifting of responsibility ; of crowding others down to the deeper darkness as we rise to greater light ; of "lading men with burdens grievous to be borne, while we ourselves touch not the burdens with one of our fingers"; but will it be blessed of God ?

II. To vote for amendments is doing what the standards of the Covenanter Church declare to be wrong.

The Reformed Presbyterian Church accepts as right nine-tenths of the Constitution of the United States. Two or three things in the body of that instrument should be changed to accord with Divine law. But the great bulk of the Constitution is right. Covenanters come in conflict with it in the Enacting Declaration: "We, the people . . . do ordain." Covenanters say that should read, "We, the people, in the name of Almighty God, and by the authority of His Son Jesus Christ . . . . do ordain." This is in accord with God's command to nations. "In all thy ways acknowledge Him and He shall direct thy paths." "The Lord doth reign." "King of kings, and Lord of lords." "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth." Covenanters reject the assumption of authority on the part of "we, the people." It is right that they should. It is wrong not to. As God's subjects, we are

not at liberty to dethrone Him. We MUST receive law at His hands. But at the institution of this government, we, the people, laid violent hands on the throne. God and His law were cast out. He was not acknowledged as the source of authority. The government, considered in their Constitution, is, for the most part, all right; but the assumption of authority is all wrong. IT IS THIS ASSUMPTION OF AUTHORITY which the Covenanter Church witnesses against. It puts "we, the people," in rebellion against God and His law. Covenanters refuse to take part in such outrage against the Omnipotent Jehovah. They believe God will crush the rebellion against Him. They live soberly as citizens in this, God's country, and testify against the wrong. They affirm that God has conferred the elective franchise on them in properly constituted government ONLY; that they, therefore, have *no franchise* in a godless one, no more so than a Union man in the South during the reign of the Confederacy.

While the Covenanter, therefore, heralds the principle to the world, viz., WE, THE PEOPLE, HAVE DETHRONED GOD, AND UNRIGHTEOUSLY USURP HIS PREROGATIVE, AND WE TESTIFY AGAINST YOU AND THE CONSTITUTION WHICH YOU HAVE SET UP, an amendment is proposed. Shall the Covenanters vote? They have witnessed, and are witnessing,

against, "we, the people," for ordaining a Constitution *without God.* Shall they, also, *ordain without God* and vote for the amendment? If they do, they could vote for ten amendments. They COULD VOTE FOR TWENTY. And as an amendment is the same as an original article, to vote for amendments is the same as declaring that *it is right to vote for all of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States*, in so far as they contain nothing wrong in themselves. But this is inconsistent with the testimony of the church; which says, We, the people, have right to ordain ONLY IN THE NAME OF GOD! Shall we testify against the people of this land for ordaining a Constitution without God, and then proceed ourselves to ordain more to it *without God?* "Thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal?" Is it not altogether inconsistent for the Covenanter to testify that it is wrong to set up kings without God, to ordain laws without His authority, and then proceed to do the same? Voting for an amendment which has in itself no recognition of God; putting it in a Constitution which has no God; what becomes of the Covenanter's testimony?

Rather than help them put the government on a more secure basis in its rejection of God, let them wrestle with some uncompromising evil as the mighty liquor traffic until they look to

God in their extremity! Honoring Him as the God of the nation, its Lawgiver and Judge, they can lay under contribution His Almighty power. "Without ME ye can do nothing."

III. To vote for amendments puts Covenanters "into politics."

These terms are used advisedly. It puts the Covenanter "into politics"! If it be right to vote for amendments, it is right and duty to advocate them before the people. And if the amendments are wrong in themselves, they should be spoken against, as well as voted against. Thus the Covenanter is "in politics," as a speaker and worker at the polls. What is his testimony worth? We repeat, WHAT IS HIS TESTIMONY WORTH when he joins the common herd at the polls, and votes his ballot as they vote theirs. *What is the church's testimony worth when it says to its members*, "GO AND VOTE! *only vote the right ticket!*" It reduces testimony to nothing, if it does not make it a positive injury.

Furthermore, it is so manifestly inconsistent that the common judgment of Covenanters keeps them away from the polls, unless in some extraordinary occasion. There were three amendments to the Constitution of Ohio voted at the elections of 1889. How many Covenanters voted for or against? How many ministers spoke for or against in their pulpits? The sense of con-

sistency keeps Covenanters away from the polls. That Synod should say, "Go and vote!" is one of the strange things which sometimes happen, but which can hardly be accounted for.

IV. It is believed that Synod's decision for "voting," although carried by such large majority, is out of joint with Covenanterism; is out of harmony with the previous practice of the church; falls squarely across former deliverances; and is especially dangerous in these "perilous times."

Space forbids the discussion of these points. It is apparent, however, that the Reformed Presbyterian Church is moving on to a crisis. The Presbyterian Church is involved in one now. What the outcome will be no one can foretell. The tendencies of the times are not without their influence on the most earnest followers of Christ. The new political philosophy, which has carried the day in voting for amendments has two political bodies; one with which the Covenant of 1871 says, "We will not incorporate"; the other, the Covenant did not know anything about. Nor did the past generations know anything about it. Nor did they seek out, by such hair-splitting philosophy, the very closest step they could take to the sin of national rebellion against God. But the grand old church is now under different influence. The new leaven has been

working until some advocate that allegiance should be left to a conscientious and enlightened discretion. It seems to be only a question of time until the new philosophy shall have found a way to vote for officers, while it can prove to a demonstration that such is not inconsistent with the principles of the church. All Covenanters who voted, for any or all of the amendments to the Constitution of Ohio, had their names put down on exactly the same official books, by exactly the same clerks, in exactly the same way, on exactly the same day, as those who voted for officers of State.

The qualifications necessary to vote for officers and for amendments are the same. In both cases, the voter must be American-born or a naturalized citizen. A foreign-born Covenanter could not vote. NOR COULD A HOME-BORN, IF HE WOULD DEAL HONESTLY AND TRULY WITH THE JUDGES OF ELECTIONS. It is not necessary to argue the question whether the Judges would permit a man to vote who told them that he would not swear allegiance to the Constitution of the United States. Everybody knows they would not. It is stated by one who is a recognized authority, that the matter was tried, and the Judges refused. They could not do otherwise. It seems to be plain, therefore, that every Covenanter who votes for amendments has taken

advantage, and not an honorable one, of the government. The government requires of a foreign-born citizen an oath of allegiance, before they will allow him to vote. Every American-born citizen, VOTING, is regarded as taking the oath by that act.

CHAPTER XVIII.

VOTING AND ORTHODOXY.

BELIEVING that the decision of Synod, while it is given by unmistakable majority, is contrary to the principles of the Covenanter Church, the following considerations are presented :

1st. *The decision marks a decline in orthodoxy.* One of the old divines has said : "When a church is about to take a lower position, the conflict does not spread itself over the whole body of truth, but some particular truth is made the point of attack. This overthrown, the denomination appears in its new, but lower position." The philosophy of this is seen in that God requires the church to distinctly, openly and decidedly reject truth, if it refuses to hold it. It will not be urged by any that the denomination, through

this decision, takes a stand of more complete separation from the nation; that it witnesses more decidedly against the nation; that a louder call to the nation to repent is given by it. No. The step which the denomination has taken was not done hastily. The matter was under discussion for twenty years. The decline from orthodoxy has been gradual. But at the last the final declaration of decline was taken by three-fourths majority of Synod. Let the deliverance of '89 be read in connection with the deliverance of '86, which is as follows:

"WHEREAS, This church has occupied a position of dissent from the government of the country on account of the infidel character of the national Constitution; and,

"WHEREAS, This reason of dissent is not removed, therefore,

"*Resolved*, 1. That voting on amendments to State Constitutions, or to the Constitution of the United States, or to revised forms of Constitutions, when conditioned on an expressed or implied approval of the national Constitution, as a compact of government, is inconsistent with our position of political dissent.

"*Resolved*, 2. That Presbyteries be directed to take no notice of inconsistencies which may have occurred during the discussion of this question by Synod.

"*Resolved*, 3. That Synod will hold Presbyteries hereafter strictly responsible for the maintenance of discipline on this point." (Min. '86, R. P. & C., p. 287.)

If these resolutions mean anything, they mean that voting for amendments is inconsistent with the principles of the church ; but these inconsistencies shall be passed over thus far, since the matter was not until now settled by Synod. (Resolution 2.) But hereafter Synod will hold the lower courts "strictly responsible for the MAINTENANCE OF DISCIPLINE ON THIS POINT." To quote this deliverance on the side of "voting," is to impeach the honor of Synod, in that they commanded censure against, and charged the Presbyteries that they would be held responsible for, what Synod would thus be declaring to be RIGHT. The deliverance of '86 is against voting. But the decision of '89 is for voting by a majority of 120 to 44. By such unmistakable majority, the church has declined from the attainments of the reformation, and the heritage of truth.

2d. *The decision renders the position of the church*, on the government question, DEEPLY METAPHYSICAL.

For an antagonist to see the position and understand the argument, while, at the same time, he disbelieves it, and rejects it, is honorable to all parties. But when a position is so *metaphysical*

that men thoroughly versed in the Scriptures as well as in logic declare their inability to *see* the position, the matter takes on a different color. The Covenanter Church is practically in the latter case to day. Thoroughly honest men, ministers and laymen, candidly confess they are not able to see the distinction which LICENSES VOTING FOR MEASURES and CENSURES VOTING FOR MEN. The literature of the United Presbyterian Church and of the General Synod, as well the open confession of these brethren in the Committee on Union, Pittsburgh, Jan. 29th, 1890, put special emphasis on this aspect of the situation. The denomination is therefore, unintentionally, subjected to some ridicule by the labyrinth of mysteries into which it has receded. It is not difficult to explain to a candidate for admission why he should stay away from the polls. But to go to a young man and say, "My brother, we do not ask you to stay away from the polls, but there are certain kinds of ballots you must vote," presents to him a problem to which he can give no satisfactory solution. When the qualifications are the same for all kinds of tickets, when the official books are the same, when everything goes to say you recognize the government equally as much in one ticket as the other, he cannot understand the difference. Fine-spun theories have little effect on a man of strong common

sense. It is believed that Synod has done a great wrong to the young men, and those seeking light, by this last decision.

3d. If the deliverance be carried out, and the young men of the church be urged off to the polls to vote for amendments, as in Ohio, for or against, three in one year, *it will produce disintegration.* It is probable that, so far as voting for temperance amendments is concerned, the trial is about past; for it appears that a "godless government," "majority rule," and "no standard of right," with a constant influx of foreign population antagonistic to temperance, put that method of dealing with the traffic in the future. But other amendments are all the while before the people. To say to the young men, "Go to the polls, work and vote for or against these," and then to say to them, "We will deprive you of your privileges in the church, and censure you, if you vote for men to carry out your commands, called amendments," is at least putting them under temptation, with a strong probability that they will be led astray. It is not the way to "come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord."

4th. If the church has begun to recede from the attainments of the reformation, if this decision marks decline in orthodoxy, *the various reforms pushed by the Covenanter Church have reached*

their high-water mark, and will henceforth lose in tone and power.

5th. *The exaltation of Christ to the throne of this nation has thereby been postponed, with the prolongation, also, of the reign of intemperance, Sabbath desecration, easy divorce, national wickedness, etc.* These forces will become more and more stubborn. With an ever-widening range, they will oppress the saints and the church of God. It requires no unusual discrimination and penetrating power to see that wickedness is growing. Righteous laws and customs are melting away as it pushes on with invincible determination. If ever the nation needed a Covenanter Church, which held aloft the standard of "CHRIST, THE NATION'S KING," this is the time! But at the crisis the standard is lowered, and our people are told to *go to the polls, and there* WITHOUT CHRIST, *make law, with "we, the people."*

CHAPTER XIX.

THE OUTLOOK.

I. The resources of the denomination were never greater than at the present hour.

The church of Christ stands to-day with enormous resources at her command. These were never greater. (a) In wealth. (b) In learning. (c) In literature. (d) In the printing press. (e) In transportation. (f) In international communication. (g) In business relations which throw all nations in contact each with the other. (h) The promise of the Spirit and the presence of Christ. (i) His command, "Go, preach the Gospel!" (j) The receptive attitude of the heathen. (k) The Macedonian cry, "Come over and help us!" These are but some of the elements of the resources at the church's command. The generations past had no such facilities. They were hindered on every hand. Now, the mountains and valleys, the crooked and rough places have been taken out of the way. Truly the walls of Jericho have again, in this nineteenth century, fallen down flat.

The Covenanter Church shares in these equip-

ments. It stands to-day with all the experience of the past, with better facilities than ever, with a membership double what it was a generation ago.

II. The Covenanter Church never had grander opportunities.

Its missions are prosperous. In any, in all of these, it is simply a question of how many workers can be sustained, with the promise amounting to all but a DECREE of a glorious harvest. In this land the public mind was never more ready to hear the distinctive principles of the denomination. The worshiping of God in ways not appointed in His Word has been pushed to such extreme that, through disgust with the operatic mockery called worship, the purity of worship as maintained by the Covenanters is looked at, not only with respectful attention, but admiration. The pool of politics has become so corrupt that sensible men are turning from it, and honor those who come out and testify, they will have neither part nor responsibility in the matter until the Lord God Almighty is acknowledged as the authority in the government. There was never a grander opportunity for the distinctive principles of the Covenanter Church than just now. The fields are white for the harvest. The very corruptions in church and state bring out in flattering prominence the old and honored principles of the reformation.

III. The OUTLOOK is one of fierce contendings.

The whole history of God's people has been written in blood. It is probable it will be in the future. There is no promise to the contrary, at least until the millennium. Fire and blood and slaughter have disputed the way. Her bravest and most valiant men have fallen, but theirs is the death of victory, like Christ's. In the conflicts of the future the Covenanters are to bear no insignificant part. They lead the advance guard, and receive the shock of battle. Out on the picket line, a target to enemies behind and bitter foes before, some desert the Covenanter standard. Thus the denomination is kept small. Some become discouraged, and wish the line to "fall back"! But no! Christ's standard never retreats. The "battle is on," and must be fought to the finish. Dismiss all flattery of IMMEDIATE SUCCESS. There is nothing to warrant the conclusions which some draw, as to the near triumph of Covenanter principles. Victory is coming; it is sure, but it is not nigh. The "drift" in the churches is in the wrong direction. Many denominations are rejecting, instead of receiving, TRUTH. They are not becoming more pure, but more corrupt. The contest will be long. Indeed, the opinion is ventured that this beloved country is to become like nations on the Continent. The chasm is ever narrowing. Foreign influences

ever becoming stronger. There is nothing to indicate immediate success on any line of reform. On the other hand, Sabbath laws are openly disregarded. "The wicked walk on every side, when the vilest men are exalted." "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God." This nation has forgotten God, and will have the experiences here indicated. It bespeaks a time of awful sorrows and national desolation. The Covenanter Church will be severely tried because of the *long time* during which its testimony must be continued. But there can be no more doubt about the final victory and triumph than of the rising of to-morrow's sun.

IV. There should be unbounded confidence in God, and in the goodness of the Covenanter cause.

The denomination under discussion is the "forerunner," as is the Baptist of a better and brighter day. True, they said, "He hath a devil!" and hard things may be said now. But the existence of the Covenanter Church is one of the brightest indications of the future. The truths held and practiced, in purity of worship, in rejecting a godless government, are teaching this great people, so that when the time does come, the preparation will have been complete. What is needed, therefore, is unbounded confi-

dence in God, and the goodness of the Covenanter cause. It is an honorable position to be the "forerunner" of a better day. Such is the Covenanter Church. The "goodness of the Covenanter cause" is as "the truth as it is in Jesus." This should rouse all to a high measure of enthusiasm.

V. There should be aggressive work in setting forth the principles of the church.

No denomination can long survive opposing forces if it neglects its own distinctive position. To attempt to hold truth FOR THOSE IN THE DENOMINATION ONLY is to invite disintegration. To survive there must be *active, aggressive work.* No distinctive principle should be held but truth; but if the TRUTH, it should be pushed energetically. The Covenanter Church holds and testifies that the Scriptures teach that a godless government is not to be supported by an oath. If that be true, here is the grandest opportunity to honor Christ by teaching such to the citizens of this land. True national reform will go to those who are sinners, in this matter, with this message. It is not only to the glory of Christ that they should, but it gives men a chance to repent by hearing the truth. To hide that truth "under a bushel" is to bring on the denomination the disapprobation of God. If the Covenanter Church will live in the conflict it

must be rid of the notion that its distinctive principles are for use WITHIN the denomination ONLY. To think that these will hinder true national reform, or postpone the day of its coming, is to suppose that God can hinder Himself. Two things should be remembered :

1st. The citizens of this nation need to know the sin of swearing to a godless Constitution. 2d. God commissions the Covenanter Church to tell them so. The life of the denomination depends on doing this duty. There MUST be aggressive work on denominational lines. Earnest, active, conscientious, aggressive work in declaring the truths which God has committed to the church, is necessary to those within, to make them zealous ; necessary to those without, to give them the opportunity to repent.

" They overcame by the blood of the Lamb, and BY THE WORD OF THEIR TESTIMONY." This last needs to be emphasized, " BY THE WORD OF THEIR TESTIMONY ! " Yes ! Testify ! Testify ! TESTIFY ! to the sin of swearing allegiance to a government which usurps the prerogatives of the Son of God ! and God promises the victory.

Therefore, let the Reformed Presbyterian Church be aggressive, and fulfill the mission and commission given by God. This the church does in congregational, presbyterial, synodical work. The resolutions, and calls to repentance,

as well as the specific statement of the sin of incorporating with the government, are set forth in no unmistakable terms. Carry it, also, to the seven millions of voters, for they are sinning against God. It will hasten the glad day of Christ's crowning.

VI. The future of the Covenanter Church depends on fidelity to the attainments of the reformation.

It is believed that the standard was lowered by last Synod when the members were told to go to the polls with the declaration that there were tickets which they could vote. But it is sincerely hoped that the lost position will be regained. There can be but little doubt that the "new order" will fall a dead letter in all cases, excepting those of great public interest. This, of itself, is sufficient to condemn the "order." Thus God, notwithstanding Synod's resolution, will keep the standard exalted, "For Christ's crown and covenant!" To be victorious, the church must be pure, and free from all contamination. The truth must be zealously guarded. The attainments for which the martyrs died have been builded in the walls of Zion, cemented in martyrs' blood. Those truths can never be lost sight of by the church. They made Scotland free! They will be the liberation of the world! No denomination has, therefore, such prospects,

and looks forth to such honor as the Covenanter. It has truth which the world needs.

THE OUTLOOK? As certainly as the Covenants rest upon the truth as it is in Jesus, so shall that truth triumph, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. More, we are nearer its triumph than any of the past generations. We are encouraged as they were not. The future is full of promise. And when that day does come, and the family of God becomes ONE in doctrine, worship, discipline and government, no denomination will be found to have more wisely and Scripturally directed its course; to have more faithfully stood by the truth as it in Jesus; to have thrown a more brilliant light out over the waters, to have more undoubtedly conserved the interests of a lost world; and to have been instrumental in rescuing a greater number, according to the membership, than the Covenanter Church. It gives us pleasure to say this, for we believe it. We yield to none in our recognition of the effectual work, the consecrated, self-sacrificing devotion of sister denominations. The unnumbered multitudes which, through their instrumentality, do "wash their robes and make them white in the blood of the Lamb," are the joy of earth and the song of heaven. May their past efficiency be but the beginning of a still more glorious future! All honor to these "laborers together with God."

But the same, also, to the church of our fathers, and which conserves the covenanted cause ! Give it the honor due for its valiant work ! When others retreated, it stood as the rock in the storm of persecution and death ! It stood for the generations to come, and bought their liberty and emancipation from Rome by shedding its blood ! It lives and stands on the same platform to-day. It enters the possibilities of the future. With the ever deepening desire to win souls and to reach the masses with the Gospel of the Son of God, properly directed and cemented within and without with the truth, the whole truth, as it is in Jesus; with new and gushing methods held strictly under control ; with a little more of the fear of God, and a little less desire to please men; above all, with the earnest, importunate prayer for the baptism anew of the Holy Ghost, and the Reformed Presbyterian Church will astonish itself in the work which, through the Spirit, it shall accomplish for Christ.

" Bear aloft, then, Zion's standard,
Crimsoned o'er with martyrs' blood;
It hath waved through lapse of ages,
Undestroyed by fire or flood.

On the field of bloody conflict
It hath waved amid the strife ;
And our fathers, to preserve it,
Periled fortune, home and life."

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: May 2006

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 017 789 669 A